ELEMENTS OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

HANS RAJ BHATIA
Rtd. Principal, K. G. K. Postgraduate College,
Moradabad, U.P.

THIRD REVISED EDITION

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

A Textbook of Educational Psychology
A New Deal in Secondary Education
Elements of Educational Psychology
The Teaching of English Spelling
What Basic Education Means
Craft in Education
General Psychology
Abnormal Psychology
Making the Most of Your Mind
Saral Shiksha Manovigyan
Vyavharik Manovigyan
Samanya Manovigyan
Asmanya Manovigyan
Shiksha Manovigyan
Saral Manovigyan
Samaj Manovigyan

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

THIS BOOK is designed to meet the requirements of university students offering social psychology as a part of the course in psychology, sociology and philosophy. In preparing it the main purpose of the author has been to place in the hands of the Indian students a simple and brief textbook on social psychology. He has been teaching this subject to postgraduate students for some time and this book has grown out of his study and experience of the difficulty of the subject and the needs of Indian students.

Most of the books on social psychology in the English language are written by Americans and are full of illustrations from life in America, and include detailed studies in the fields of sociology and anthropology. Indian students are not quite conversant with them, and therefore an attempt has been made in this book to illustrate facts and principles of social psychology from social life in India. It is hoped that this will make for a better and easier understanding of the subject on the one hand and of social situations and problems in our country on the other. The author feels that even those who are not offering social psychology as a part of their course in the university will benefit by a reading of this book.

Social psychology is still at a formative stage and most of the authors bring in a large number of topics which do not, strictly speaking, belong to this field. While the boundaries of general psychology, social psychology, sociology and anthropology are more or less clearly defined there are a number of topics which fall within the scope of more than one discipline. While the approach of every author on this new branch of study has to be inter-disciplinary he has to be very careful that the course should not be made unduly cumbersome and heavy. The author has, therefore, avoided such topics as juvenile delinquency, anti-social behaviour, social significance of age, social psychology of industry and the like.

mental investigations carried on to study related problems but such references had to be brief. At other places a plea has been made that certain social problems of our country should be studied in detail. The reader will kindly appreciate that it is neither possible nor desirable to deal with them in detail in an elementary book on the subject.

The author is greatly indebted to a number of excellent books on the subject written by eminent scholars in the field. Social psychology is a discipline of very recent growth and its contents and boundaries are defined mostly by such eminent scholars as Kimball Young, Newcomb, Sherif, Sargent and Williamson, Krech and Crutchfield, Bird and Klineberg, to mention only the most well known, and a writer of an elementary textbook on the subject cannot help being influenced by his study of their works.

The author wishes to express his deep sense of gratitude to these scholars and has listed them at the close of each chapter in the book, and would earnestly advise students to consult them for further study. He has used the terms and concepts of eminent scholars and has referred readers to their works in the footnotes. Obviously any textbook which omits reference to such concepts would not be worth any notice but at the same time for a fuller understanding of those concepts and topics the students must turn to the works of such eminent scholars. It is earnestly hoped that students will do so and that this book will serve as a useful introduction to the subject.

H. R. Bhatia

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

In this edition the text has been thoroughly revised, some sections have been added and others enlarged to make the treatment of certain topics fuller and clearer. It is hoped that this will add to the usefulness of the book which teachers and students of colleges and universities have so readily welcomed.

September, 1970

H. R. Bhatia

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

IN THIS edition a number of sections have been re-written and expanded. The treatment of topics like Socialization, Culture, Social roles, Dimensions of attitudes, Change in attitudes, Membership and reference groups, Group cohesiveness, Types of leaders has been greatly expanded and some new sections like The concept of needs, Culture and society, The ideal self, Self-esteem, Consistency in attitudes and Organizations have been added. These additions it is hoped will add to the usefulness of the book.

HANS RAJ BHATIA

September 1974

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

PSYCHOLOGY studies human behaviour in terms of responses to any and every kind of situation that life presents By behaviour or responses we mean all kinds of activities, adjustments, processes and experiences of an individual. Human psychology has for its subject-matter such activities and processes as learning, perceiving, feeling, thinking and acting, and it seeks to collect, organize, describe, explain and interpret facts of behaviour and experience. In its study and investigations modern psychology employs scientific methods of observation and experiment and reaches reliable and valid conclusions with regard to its subject-matter.

Social psychology, as the term suggests, is concerned with behaviour or responses in social situations, that is, behaviour and responses of an individual in relation to other individuals or groups of individuals. Social psychology is the study of activities of the individual as influenced by other individuals; it is the study of man in society, of the individual in action at the social level.

Now the question is: What, from the point of view of the individual, is a social situation? The most obvious answer is that a social situation is characterized by the presence of people. These may be directly and immediately present or their presence may be represented by psychological events like percepts, memories, hopes or fears connected with them Thus social behaviour may take place in direct reference to other people as when face-to-face with friends we greet them with a smile or repel them with a frown. Or it may take place in the absence of people though it is nevertheless influenced by reference to them Getting ready for a party Mrs Kapoor is influenced in her choice of a *sari* by what she considers to be the reactions of her friends. Thus though her friends are not physically present their psychological presence affects her behaviour.

The next question is: What are the characteristics of people

whose psychological presence affects our behaviour? They are *sensitive,* that is, they perceive us and react to us. They are *communicative,* that is, they use gestures which mean the same to us as they mean to them. Language is the best of significant gestures even though occasionally its ambiguities lead to misunderstanding. They *learn* to solve problems, to reduce tensions, seek rewards and avoid punishments. Learning and relearning involve emotional experiences which create or change emotional attitudes. Thus, not only what is learned but the way in which it is learned is essential in understanding social behaviour. Lastly, such people *make adjustments,* for example, they take toward themselves the attitude which their associates and friends take toward them. Adjustment is generally measured in terms of the relationship between a person's social status, that is, the position in society given to him or assumed by him on the one hand, and the social role or the actual behaviour he is called upon to perform on the other. The more status and roles coincide the greater is the adjustment. When an individual is called upon to play a role which is incompatible with his mental and moral make-up, for example, with his attitudes, there is a feeling of insecurity resulting from lack of adjustment.

One of the problems of the social psychologist is the discovery of conditions which when changed will change the social behaviour of the individual. He has, therefore, to compare and contrast many social situations and correlate them with the responses of individuals, and in the process he must describe all the conditions. These conditions will include the physical and the geographical environment, the economic and political influences, the tribal and national factors, the family and community ways and customs, the patterns of co-operation and competition, and the folkways and institutions which affect the behaviour of the individual.

In any act of social behaviour there are three factors which are always operating. In the first place there is the individual, the biological organism with intellectual and emotional endowments, innate drives, physique, general health and the like. Secondly, there is the social stage on which social activity takes place, the cultural and social heritage, the geographical factors, families, communities, nations and institutions. Thirdly, there are the modifications which take place in the biological and psychological organism called human nature as a consequence of the constant interaction

between the first two. Such modifications lead to the development of socio-genic drives, habits, attitudes, traits which are summed up in human nature or personality. The biological heritage starts activity but the nature of activity is influenced by the social environment. Hunger, sex, and other biological impulses set in motion the activities of the individual, but these take place in social and geographical environment, which, besides providing opportunities for their expression and fulfilment set limits to their growth and development and the consequent modifications of the individual organism. Thus the individual is tied to his environment both for the satisfactions of his needs and for the growth and development of his personality.

Social behaviour has been described as interaction between the individual and his social environment, while social environment has been described as interpersonal relations, intergroup relations, the customs, ideals and institutions, resulting from such interactions, language, art, literature, religion, science and technology. These act on the individual as stimuli as well as influence responses made by him. The child is not a passive recipient of impressions from the social environment but is an active participant in the social drama staged around him. He is an organism with certain needs to be satisfied and they determine his goals. In seeking satisfaction of his needs and the realization of his goals his behaviour is selective and has motives. As he grows he acquires new needs and motives and new modes of behaviour which are largely influenced by his social and cultural heritage All human beings eat to satisfy their hunger, but what they eat and how and when they eat is largely determined by their social and cultural setting. In eating they develop new motives like following a pattern of etiquette strictly, showing off by giving impressive lunches and dinners, competing with others in the standard of their dinners or trying to please their bosses through food and the like. Social psychology studies how biological and social factors interplay and how the individual is moulded by traditions, customs, standards of value, and laws throughout his life history

Social interaction

The upshot of our discussion is that the individual achieves a personality through social interaction and the very concept of society implies interaction of individuals. Social behaviour means

interaction which takes place between the human organism and his environment when his behaviour reflects directly or indirectly the behaviour of other human organisms. Social interaction, therefore, stands for those social processes in which personalities and groups stimulate and respond to each other. It is a two-way process by which individuals and groups stimulating each other themselves undergo modifications of behaviour. The definition of social psychology which has been offered in the previous section implies that the problem of social interaction is one of the important and central problems of our study. In fact the most active and comprehensive approach to the subject-matter of social psychology is through the study of social interaction, for it lays bare the ancient problem of crowd behaviour as well as helps to analyse the formation of social norms, prejudices and attitudes, the phenomena of rumour, propaganda, fashions, leadership and the like, and to understand the problems of social control and social change and progress.

Social interaction may be classified on three bases: on the number of persons involved, on the degree of intimacy among persons, and on the nature of social processes involved. Let us study them one by one.

In terms of the number of persons involved social interaction may be person-to-person, group-to-person or person-to-group and group-to-group. The mother-child behaviour is an example of person-to-person interaction. The mother responds to the needs of the infant and in a few weeks the infant responds to attention and smiles when smiled at or gurgles when called. His responses are positive or negative according as the experience is pleasant or unpleasant. The person-to-person relation soon includes other members of the family. As yet the infant has no awareness that they belong to one family or group. Adults dominate the child but soon enough the child too dominates the adults around. The 'spoilt' child makes the whole family run around him. Many grown-up persons prefer person-to-person relationships and avoid groups, clubs, assemblies and the like. They have two or three friends with whom they share their thoughts and life.

The second of social interaction in terms of the number of persons involved is person-to-group interaction as is manifested in the family. Soon enough the child begins to see that people around him belong to a group, are somehow connected and stand together, and he accepts their patterns of behaviour and attitudes. Family

traditions and ways become a part of his social heritage, he begins to realize the factor of status in the family and to recognize and accept his role in this social group. Later he identifies himself with groups outside the family. Some times such associations are temporary for a specific purpose such as the play-group and sometimes they are more enduring such as his contacts in the school. His associations are diversified and though the family continues to pull him he begins to recognize diverging patterns of group behaviour and identifies himself with different groups at different times and begins to play varying roles. In some of the groups he dominates and dictates, in others he has to submit to group purposes, programmes, and ways. An autocrat or dictator tries to enforce conformity and obedience thus making person-to-group social interaction a 'one-way' traffic. Similarly, in highly organized tribes with rigid customs and taboos the individual has only to carry out the behests of the tribes blindly and social interaction is one-sided. It is only in democratic societies that interaction between groups and persons on a reciprocal basis is ensured.

The third type of social interaction based on numbers is group-to-group. It is more complex. Rivalry among neighbouring families, international wars, conflict between capital and labour, communal riots, or the World Health Organization are examples of group-to-group social interaction. Groups are generally classified into three types. The *primary groups* are characterized by intimate face-to-face association and co-operation, members are closely identified with a common life and purpose, and there is a strong degree of intimacy and solidarity among their members. The family is the most important primary group which makes for unity of thought and action and in which members make sacrifices for each other willingly and with pleasure. The *secondary groups* need not have face-to-face association and are being formed and re-formed for specific purposes. Relationship in secondary groups are casual and temporary such as in clubs, rate payers' association, political parties, Boy Scouts. Those which are more permanent become institutions with elaborate organization and specific programmes. Then there are *tertiary* or *marginal groups* like those which are formed in waiting-rooms, buses and trains, on the pavement, or in a cinema show. They are purely transitory though they may act together for a short time to achieve a temporary goal, as passengers in a railway compartment work together to block a new-comer

interaction which takes place between the human organism and his environment when his behaviour reflects directly or indirectly the behaviour of other human organisms. Social interaction, therefore, stands for those social processes in which personalities and groups stimulate and respond to each other. It is a two-way process by which individuals and groups stimulating each other themselves undergo modifications of behaviour. The definition of social psychology which has been offered in the previous section implies that the problem of social interaction is one of the important and central problems of our study. In fact the most active and comprehensive approach to the subject-matter of social psychology is through the study of social interaction, for it lays bare the ancient problem of crowd behaviour as well as helps to analyse the formation of social norms, prejudices and attitudes, the phenomena of rumour, propaganda, fashions, leadership and the like, and to understand the problems of social control and social change and progress.

Social interaction may be classified on three bases: on the number of persons involved, on the degree of intimacy among persons, and on the nature of social processes involved. Let us study them one by one.

In terms of the number of persons involved social interaction may be person-to-person, group-to-person or person-to-group and group-to-group. The mother-child behaviour is an example of person-to-person interaction. The mother responds to the needs of the infant and in a few weeks the infant responds to attention and smiles when smiled at or gurgles when called. His responses are positive or negative according as the experience is pleasant or unpleasant. The person-to-person relation soon includes other members of the family. As yet the infant has no awareness that they belong to one family or group. Adults dominate the child but soon enough the child too dominates the adults around. The 'spoilt' child makes the whole family run around him. Many grown-up persons prefer person-to-person relationships and avoid groups, clubs, assemblies and the like. They have two or three friends with whom they share their thoughts and life.

The second of social interaction in terms of the number of persons involved is person-to-group interaction as is manifested in the family. Soon enough the child begins to see that people around him belong to a group, are somehow connected and stand together, and he accepts their patterns of behaviour and attitudes. Family

traditions and ways become a part of his social heritage, he begins to realize the factor of status in the family and to recognize and accept his role in this social group. Later he identifies himself with groups outside the family. Some times such associations are temporary for a specific purpose such as the play-group and sometimes they are more enduring such as his contacts in the school. His associations are diversified and though the family continues to pull him he begins to recognize diverging patterns of group behaviour and identifies himself with different groups at different times and begins to play varying roles In some of the groups he dominates and dictates, in others he has to submit to group purposes, programmes, and ways. An autocrat or dictator tries to enforce conformity and obedience thus making person-to-group social interaction a 'one-way' traffic. Similarly, in highly organized tribes with rigid customs and taboos the individual has only to carry out the behests of the tribes blindly and social interaction is one-sided. It is only in democratic societies that interaction between groups and persons on a reciprocal basis is ensured.

The third type of social interaction based on numbers is group-to-group. It is more complex Rivalry among neighbouring families, international wars, conflict between capital and labour, communal riots, or the World Health Organization are examples of group-to-group social interaction. Groups are generally classified into three types. The *primary groups* are characterized by intimate face-to-face association and co-operation, members are closely identified with a common life and purpose, and there is a strong degree of intimacy and solidarity among their members. The family is the most important primary group which makes for unity of thought and action and in which members make sacrifices for each other willingly and with pleasure. The *secondary groups* need not have face-to-face association and are being formed and re-formed for specific purposes. Relationship in secondary groups are casual and temporary such as in clubs, rate payers' association, political parties, Boy Scouts. Those which are more permanent become institutions with elaborate organization and specific programmes. Then there are *tertiary* or *marginal groups* like those which are formed in waiting-rooms, buses and trains, on the pavement, or in a cinema show. They are purely transitory though they may act together for a short time to achieve a temporary goal, as passengers in a railway compartment work together to block a new-comer

interaction which takes place between the human organism and his environment when his behaviour reflects directly or indirectly the behaviour of other human organisms. Social interaction, therefore, stands for those social processes in which personalities and groups stimulate and respond to each other. It is a two-way process by which individuals and groups stimulating each other themselves undergo modifications of behaviour. The definition of social psychology which has been offered in the previous section implies that the problem of social interaction is one of the important and central problems of our study. In fact the most active and comprehensive approach to the subject-matter of social psychology is through the study of social interaction, for it lays bare the ancient problem of crowd behaviour as well as helps to analyse the formation of social norms, prejudices and attitudes, the phenomena of rumour, propaganda, fashions, leadership and the like, and to understand the problems of social control and social change and progress.

Social interaction may be classified on three bases: on the number of persons involved, on the degree of intimacy among persons, and on the nature of social processes involved. Let us study them one by one.

In terms of the number of persons involved social interaction may be person-to-person, group-to-person or person-to-group and group-to-group. The mother-child behaviour is an example of person-to-person interaction. The mother responds to the needs of the infant and in a few weeks the infant responds to attention and smiles when smiled at or gurgles when called. His responses are positive or negative according as the experience is pleasant or unpleasant. The person-to-person relation soon includes other members of the family. As yet the infant has no awareness that they belong to one family or group. Adults dominate the child but soon enough the child too dominates the adults around. The 'spoilt' child makes the whole family run around him. Many grown-up persons prefer person-to-person relationships and avoid groups, clubs, assemblies and the like. They have two or three friends with whom they share their thoughts and life.

The second of social interaction in terms of the number of persons involved is person-to-group interaction as is manifested in the family. Soon enough the child begins to see that people around him belong to a group, are somehow connected and stand together, and he accepts their patterns of behaviour and attitudes. Family

traditions and ways become a part of his social heritage, he begins to realize the factor of status in the family and to recognize and accept his role in this social group. Later he identifies himself with groups outside the family. Some times such associations are temporary for a specific purpose such as the play-group and sometimes they are more enduring such as his contacts in the school. His associations are diversified and though the family continues to pull him he begins to recognize diverging patterns of group behaviour and identifies himself with different groups at different times and begins to play varying roles. In some of the groups he dominates and dictates, in others he has to submit to group purposes, programmes, and ways. An autocrat or dictator tries to enforce conformity and obedience thus making person-to-group social interaction a 'one-way' traffic. Similarly, in highly organized tribes with rigid customs and taboos the individual has only to carry out the behests of the tribes blindly and social interaction is one-sided. It is only in democratic societies that interaction between groups and persons on a reciprocal basis is ensured.

The third type of social interaction based on numbers is group-to-group. It is more complex. Rivalry among neighbouring families, international wars, conflict between capital and labour, communal riots, or the World Health Organization are examples of group-to-group social interaction. Groups are generally classified into three types. The *primary groups* are characterized by intimate face-to-face association and co-operation, members are closely identified with a common life and purpose, and there is a strong degree of intimacy and solidarity among their members The family is the most important primary group which makes for unity of thought and action and in which members make sacrifices for each other willingly and with pleasure. The *secondary groups* need not have face-to-face association and are being formed and re-formed for specific purposes. Relationship in secondary groups are casual and temporary such as in clubs, rate payers' association, political parties, Boy Scouts Those which are more permanent become institutions with elaborate organization and specific programmes. Then there are *tertiary or marginal groups* like those which are formed in waiting-rooms, buses and trains, on the pavement, or in a cinema show. They are purely transitory though they may act together for a short time to achieve a temporary goal, as passengers in a railway compartment work together to block a new-comer

because of overcrowding or spectators applaud a player at a match.

Secondly, social interaction may be considered from the point of view of intimacy obtaining between persons and groups. The child does not have the same intensity of feeling in identifying himself with his family, play-group, class, or community. The feeling of belongingness, of sharing common purpose and programme of groups, varies from group to group, and in several cases social interaction is less reciprocal. Social interaction within one's family is marked by an intensity of feeling which may be altogether lukewarm if not absent within a group watching an accident on the road.

Thirdly, social interaction may be classified on the basis of social processes involved in it. Such social processes are: *adjustment, opposition,* and *co-operation.* The human organism adjusts itself to its environment and changes its behaviour to suit geographical and social conditions. Similarly, individuals and groups establish relations on a mutually satisfactory basis. In the course of his upbringing the child comes to accept the family patterns of behaviour, the traditional ways and customs of parents, their modes of eating, dressing and communicating. In the beginning he is passive and receptive but as he grows older he modifies the behaviour of others through his own selective behaviour. He develops preferences and attitudes and individuals around him modify their behaviour to adjust themselves to him. There are other groups and institutions with their own modes, attitudes and values, and they come to be accepted by their members through a process of social adjustment. But adjustment does not mean blind conformity, and the facts of war and revolutions prove that social adjustment is sometimes achieved through radical changes in the cultural pattern on the one hand and through processes of social control on the other.

The second process of *opposition* is in ample evidence in modern society in which competition and conflicts abound. In some tribes and old cultures individuals are so surrounded by traditions, customs, and taboos that the role of each is well marked out leaving little scope for rivalry or conflict. But even then systems of punishment and rewards do give rise to all sorts of opposition in proprietary rights and individual status. But in our own times with vastly improved means of transport and communication the world has become smaller, barriers of isolation between individuals and groups have been broken and opposition in terms of competition

and conflict has greatly increased. Such opposition may be economic, political, cultural, religious, or racial and in more recent times deliberate and organized efforts are being made to narrow down the areas of opposition and promote international understanding and co-operation. Even within an individual there may be opposition caused by conflicting loyalties to different groups and we all have experiences of inner struggle at the time of choosing parties, people, or courses of action. Such opposition and struggle within a person is also a social process in so far as it is caused by social contacts. Or the individual may like to play different roles for which he is not equipped and it may cause conflict. Often the individual adopts different behaviour patterns for different groups and such a course makes him a creature of drift without any moorings. Opposition between groups is illustrated most poignantly by power blocs of today and is based on different social structures and systems of value. Such opposition is essential for social change but it must be controlled and directed to avoid world conflicts and disasters.

The third social process is *co-operation*. In co-operation individuals and groups work together without conflict. Co-operation may be voluntary when co-operating persons and groups have a common purpose and work harmoniously for its achievement. Mutual helpfulness and goodwill are characteristic of this type of co-operation. To begin with the child is self-centred and it is only gradually that he learns to give and take help. In modern industrial society in which jobs are highly specialized voluntary co-operation is a basic fact, and division of labour is not merely a matter of mutual dependence but of close co-operation to achieve certain goals and targets in production. It is significant therefore to educate labour about the overall objectives of the industrial plant in which they are employed and their dependence on other industrial units either for raw materials or for consumption of their products. But often co-operation is forced by social pressure or governmental coercion and is found at all levels and in all areas of social interaction. In schools and colleges, trade and commerce, administration and civic living, fear of punishment and disapproval is an important factor in developing and securing co-operation. There is considerable divergence of opinion among sociologists and social psychologists whether all co-operation should be forced or voluntary. The controversy is the basis of dispute between dictatorship

and democracy and has often been raised in social and political discussion. 'Should civil liberties be assured to all? Should trade unions be allowed to organize strikes and paralyse production? Should communal riots be ruthlessly suppressed by force or should people be educated to accept and tolerate other communities and religions?' While fanatical thinking will take sides actual social situations demand both types of co-operation.

Social psychology may also be described as the study of relations and processes involved in social interaction. Interpersonal relations within a group, relations among groups, social institutions and organizations, and processes of perception, memory, learning, adjustment, communication, imitation, suggestion, competition, and co-operation through which persons and groups come in contact with each other and develop a large variety of relations are of great interest to social psychology. These relations do not depend on individual behaviour alone nor can they be understood merely by collecting and putting together all the responses of an individual. It is the interplay and interaction which is most important, for it creates new and unique situations which stimulate individuals and groups to new and unique responses. Thus changes take place in both individuals and social environment as a result of social interaction, and individual and group behaviour gets its distinctive character from the situations brought about by such social interaction.

Some problems of social psychology

In defining social psychology a number of terms are used. It is the study of man in society, the study of the individual in 'the social world' (Katz and Schank) or 'the psychological world' (Brown). The vast array of social facts arising in the context of interpersonal and intergroup relations of human beings are studied in social psychology. Usually we speak of two worlds, the world of things and places, and the world of persons and groups. Even the material world assumes meaning and value from the social world. Certain things we enjoy more in the company of friends. Death, marriage, love, social success, competition, and other social events impart a new significance to our material world and its changes.

One main problem of social psychology is to study the processes by which an individual comes to be socialized from birth

to maturity. Every child starts life as an egoist, self-centred, impatient and pleasure-seeking. At first in child-parent relationship and later in relationship with other children, friends, teachers, and people he meets in an ever widening sphere, he is induced to defer his pleasures, consider the needs of others, become educated, develop self-control and finally to assume some degree of responsibility in society. This long process of socialization, of social growth through social functioning, is ultimately a process of social interaction.

Socialization arises from definite organic and environmental factors which affect all human behaviour. These factors include the physiological equipment with which man faces the problems of the world, his bodily structure, sensory apparatus, muscular capacity, organic needs, emotions, and mental abilities. The environmental factors include not only things and persons but also the rich and complicated social heritage which the individual must not only know and understand but to which he must reasonably conform through flexible forms of conduct. What is the nature of individual organism? What are his basic needs? How do they make him act? How does he acquire other needs? How do institutions like the home, the school, the caste or community, property, religion, art and culture affect his needs, habits, attitudes and personality? Does social status, poverty or prosperity, affect his social behaviour? How far does social heredity, that is, customs, traditions, values and institutions which have been inherited from the past, regulate and mould an individual's behaviour? Social psychologists are called upon to study the effect of cultural differences on the personality of individuals

Since all social phenomena, social organization, social change or intermingling of different cultures revolves round human personality, their interrelation with personality becomes the central problem for social psychology. In India the family customs, the caste, the moral and social values stressed in education, the form of government, the economic order, the social purpose and religious beliefs bear on the personality of a Hindu. How is he being affected by growing industrialization, democratic ways, international contacts or political ideas would be an interesting subject of study for the social psychologist.

Members of some communities develop a natural inclination for a specific pattern of life, for example, Marwaris take to busi-

ness, Madrasis to jobs in government service or Sikhs to technical work. Some families take to law or medicine from generation to generation. The Hindu system of castes and classes has tended to circumscribe the work and life of millions of people. Again extreme types of climate also bear on the life patterns of people and affect their personality. People in snowy parts may be more steady emotionally than those living in tropical climates. People living in regions frequently visited by natural calamities like earthquakes, sea-storms, epidemics or wars, may develop fatalism. Political systems also affect the approach of citizens as do the economic and industrial systems. Such influences and their consequent changes in the behaviour and personality of the individual are of great interest to social psychology.

Social psychology and other sciences

It is obvious that *general* or *individual psychology* and social psychology must be very closely related. The former studies the life, activities, and behaviour of individuals with a view to obtain generalizations or laws which govern them. It is a scientific study of individual's reactions to stimuli of any kind and his activities in a large variety of situations, and has accumulated a large body of systematic knowledge concerning processes of perception, memory, learning, imagination, thinking, attitudes, behaviour, and personality. Social psychology is also interested in individual behaviour but only in so far as it is aroused and stimulated by other individuals, singly or in groups. A parent scolding a child, a teacher advising his pupil, boys quarrelling with each other, a crowd cheering an actor or a speaker, legislators debating a bill, a lawyer arguing a case, are some of the situations in which an individual's behaviour is largely influenced by others. These other individuals may not be present physically as it happens when we are reading a newspaper or listening to a broadcast. Mere mental pictures of individuals with whom we have associated in the past affect our behaviour. Traditions, customs, laws, values, and other social influences embody what other individuals or groups, past and present, have come to expect of us in our conduct. The individual is constantly reacting to other individuals, his life and behaviour has always a social setting. Psychologists in general are interested in the cultural and social environment in which the individual lives and behaves and in which his persona-

lity is shaped. In fact it is very difficult to indicate processes and activities of the individual which are altogether free from social influences. So while it may be too much to claim that all psychology is social psychology, it cannot be overlooked that the centre of emphasis and interest in social psychology is the same as that of general psychology, that is, the behaviour of the individual. Nor can social psychology be described as a branch of general psychology, for it has its own viewpoint and data, a distinctive approach to human behaviour. In the first place general or individual psychology is not as strongly aware of the significant part played by social influences and culture in moulding human behaviour and shaping personality as social psychology is. There are certain types of behaviour for which culture is mostly responsible and while social psychology studies individual behaviour its centre of interest is the network of social and cultural influences bearing on it. General psychology describes the innate and acquired needs of an individual, how his interests, goals and purposes determine processes of attention, knowledge, and action. It analyses how learning takes place by trial and error or insight, how habits are formed or how his behaviour is conditioned. Social psychology will study how innate needs are modified by social and cultural influences, how things, persons, and situations come to mean differently as a result of such influences or how social learning takes place. There is a great deal of overlapping, but the approach of the two fields of study is distinct, and this distinctive approach of each is helpful in developing knowledge and thought.

Secondly, there are many problems of human behaviour which must be treated quite apart from social influences such as sensory perception, memory, imagination, emotional experiences or integration of personality. How different types of sensory apparatus work, how the glandular system operates and affects behaviour, how after-images occur, how eyes are adapted to dark, the phenomena of conditioning, retroactive inhibition, transfer of learning, problem-solving are topics which fall well within general psychology and may not be studied in social psychology at all.

Social psychology and *sociology* too have much in common and are interdependent. Social psychology is as much a part of the course on sociology as it is of psychology, and here too there will be found much overlapping along with differences in

ness, Madrasis to jobs in government service or Sikhs to technical work. Some families take to law or medicine from generation to generation. The Hindu system of castes and classes has tended to circumscribe the work and life of millions of people. Again extreme types of climate also bear on the life patterns of people and affect their personality. People in snowy parts may be more steady emotionally than those living in tropical climates. People living in regions frequently visited by natural calamities like earthquakes, sea-storms, epidemics or wars, may develop fatalism. Political systems also affect the approach of citizens as do the economic and industrial systems. Such influences and their consequent changes in the behaviour and personality of the individual are of great interest to social psychology.

Social psychology and other sciences

It is obvious that *general* or *individual psychology* and social psychology must be very closely related. The former studies the life, activities, and behaviour of individuals with a view to obtain generalizations or laws which govern them. It is a scientific study of individual's reactions to stimuli of any kind and his activities in a large variety of situations, and has accumulated a large body of systematic knowledge concerning processes of perception, memory, learning, imagination, thinking, attitudes, behaviour, and personality. Social psychology is also interested in individual behaviour but only in so far as it is aroused and stimulated by other individuals, singly or in groups. A parent scolding a child, a teacher advising his pupil, boys quarrelling with each other, a crowd cheering an actor or a speaker, legislators debating a bill, a lawyer arguing a case, are some of the situations in which an individual's behaviour is largely influenced by others. These other individuals may not be present physically as it happens when we are reading a newspaper or listening to a broadcast. Mere mental pictures of individuals with whom we have associated in the past affect our behaviour. Traditions, customs, laws, values, and other social influences embody what other individuals or groups, past and present, have come to expect of us in our conduct. The individual is constantly reacting to other individuals, his life and behaviour has always a social setting. Psychologists in general are interested in the cultural and social environment in which the individual lives and behaves and in which his persona-

lity is shaped. In fact it is very difficult to indicate processes and activities of the individual which are altogether free from social influences. So while it may be too much to claim that all psychology is social psychology, it cannot be overlooked that the centre of emphasis and interest in social psychology is the same as that of general psychology, that is, the behaviour of the individual. Nor can social psychology be described as a branch of general psychology, for it has its own viewpoint and data, a distinctive approach to human behaviour. In the first place general or individual psychology is not as strongly aware of the significant part played by social influences and culture in moulding human behaviour and shaping personality as social psychology is. There are certain types of behaviour for which culture is mostly responsible and while social psychology studies individual behaviour its centre of interest is the network of social and cultural influences bearing on it. General psychology describes the innate and acquired needs of an individual, how his interests, goals and purposes determine processes of attention, knowledge, and action. It analyses how learning takes place by trial and error or insight, how habits are formed or how his behaviour is conditioned. *Social psychology will study how innate needs are modified by* social and cultural influences, how things, persons, and situations come to mean differently as a result of such influences or how social learning takes place. There is a great deal of overlapping, but the approach of the two fields of study is distinct, and this distinctive approach of each is helpful in developing knowledge and thought.

Secondly, there are many problems of human behaviour which must be treated quite apart from social influences such as sensory perception, memory, imagination, emotional experiences or integration of personality. How different types of sensory apparatus work, how the glandular system operates and affects behaviour, how after-images occur, how eyes are adapted to dark, the phenomena of conditioning, retroactive inhibition, transfer of learning, problem-solving are topics which fall well within general psychology and may not be studied in social psychology at all.

Social psychology and *sociology* too have much in common and are interdependent. Social psychology is as much a part of the course on sociology as it is of psychology, and here too there will be found much overlapping along with differences in

ness, Madrasis to jobs in government service or Sikhs to technical work. Some families take to law or medicine from generation to generation. The Hindu system of castes and classes has tended to circumscribe the work and life of millions of people. Again extreme types of climate also bear on the life patterns of people and affect their personality. People in snowy parts may be more steady emotionally than those living in tropical climates. People living in regions frequently visited by natural calamities like earthquakes, sea-storms, epidemics or wars, may develop fatalism. Political systems also affect the approach of citizens as do the economic and industrial systems. Such influences and their consequent changes in the behaviour and personality of the individual are of great interest to social psychology.

Social psychology and other sciences

It is obvious that *general* or *individual psychology* and social psychology must be very closely related. The former studies the life, activities, and behaviour of individuals with a view to obtain generalizations or laws which govern them. It is a scientific study of individual's reactions to stimuli of any kind and his activities in a large variety of situations, and has accumulated a large body of systematic knowledge concerning processes of perception, memory, learning, imagination, thinking, attitudes, behaviour, and personality. Social psychology is also interested in individual behaviour but only in so far as it is aroused and stimulated by other individuals, singly or in groups. A parent scolding a child, a teacher advising his pupil, boys quarrelling with each other, a crowd cheering an actor or a speaker, legislators debating a bill, a lawyer arguing a case, are some of the situations in which an individual's behaviour is largely influenced by others. These other individuals may not be present physically as it happens when we are reading a newspaper or listening to a broadcast. Mere mental pictures of individuals with whom we have associated in the past affect our behaviour. Traditions, customs, laws, values, and other social influences embody what other individuals or groups, past and present, have come to expect of us in our conduct. The individual is constantly reacting to other individuals, his life and behaviour has always a social setting. Psychologists in general are interested in the cultural and social environment in which the individual lives and behaves and in which his persona-

lity is shaped. In fact it is very difficult to indicate processes and activities of the individual which are altogether free from social influences. So while it may be too much to claim that all psychology is social psychology, it cannot be overlooked that the centre of emphasis and interest in social psychology is the same as that of general psychology, that is, the behaviour of the individual. Nor can social psychology be described as a branch of general psychology, for it has its own viewpoint and data, a distinctive approach to human behaviour. In the first place general or individual psychology is not as strongly aware of the significant part played by social influences and culture in moulding human behaviour and shaping personality as social psychology is. There are certain types of behaviour for which culture is mostly responsible and while social psychology studies individual behaviour its centre of interest is the network of social and cultural influences bearing on it. General psychology describes the innate and acquired needs of an individual, how his interests, goals and purposes determine processes of attention, knowledge, and action. It analyses how learning takes place by trial and error or insight, how habits are formed or how his behaviour is conditioned. Social psychology will study how innate needs are modified by social and cultural influences, how things, persons, and situations come to mean differently as a result of such influences or how social learning takes place. There is a great deal of overlapping, but the approach of the two fields of study is distinct, and this distinctive approach of each is helpful in developing knowledge and thought.

Secondly, there are many problems of human behaviour which must be treated quite apart from social influences such as sensory perception, memory, imagination, emotional experiences or integration of personality. How different types of sensory apparatus work, how the glandular system operates and affects behaviour, how after-images occur, how eyes are adapted to dark, the phenomena of conditioning, retroactive inhibition, transfer of learning, problem-solving are topics which fall well within general psychology and may not be studied in social psychology at all.

Social psychology and *sociology* too have much in common and are interdependent. Social psychology is as much a part of the course on sociology as it is of psychology, and here too there will be found much overlapping along with differences in

emphasis, points of view and problems to be studied.

While psychology begins with the individual, sociology begins with the social setting, the entire social milieu of the individual. It is a study of the cultural patterns, analyses social organization and seeks to discover the nature and extent of social control through interpersonal and intergroup interaction. What are the various patterns of people, how is population distributed and how does it grow, what types of social groups and associations prevail, what are the patterns of social and cultural behaviour like customs, folkways, mores and institutions, and what types of social processes like competition, co-operation, assimilation and adjustment operate are some of the main subjects which fall within the scope of sociology. Its main concern is how society is organized, what factors make it change, what are the different patterns of social change, how problems of urbanization, delinquency, divorce, class, community and race prejudices, poverty, disease, crime, war and the like must be studied and solved and what main agencies should be used to direct and control processes of social change.

Human society is made up of a number of groups, communities and subgroups. They are interdependent and yet distinct from each other. They have their own complex structure and organization, their own history and body of traditions, customs and values. Members have different roles to play, different rights and obligations. Often there are disparities in the status of women in different groups and communities, children are differently treated and educated, male adults have different attitudes towards their families and hold different occupational places. Thus society is a very complex structure in which different groups and subgroups are interwoven. Sociology studies the different types of grouping of human beings, how their interaction brings about different patterns of social behaviour, how different social systems affect each other, and how social changes take place as a result of constant interaction.

Thus social psychology and sociology cannot help being very close to each other. Social psychology draws upon sociology for an understanding of the structure, organization and culture of societies to which individuals belong and in terms of which their social behaviour must be explained. On the other hand sociology must turn to social psychology for an explanation of

those psychological facts and factors which make for stable social organizations or for rapid changes in society. Human needs for companionship, recognition, communication, etc. are *for ever seeking channels for satisfaction and to that end affecting* changes in social environment. A knowledge of such needs is provided by social psychology. Sociology studies society, social psychology studies the individual in society and since the individual and society cannot exist and subsist without each other, social psychology and sociology are interdependent and very closely related to each other.

The science of *anthropology*, particularly *cultural anthropology* or *ethnology* studies the customs, institutions, and behaviour of primitive peoples. Ralph Linton has aptly remarked:

> The individual has been assigned to Psychology, society to Sociology and culture to Cultural Anthropology.... It is now becoming apparent that the integration between the individual, society and culture is so close and their interaction so continuous that the investigator who tries to work with any one of them without reference to the other two soon comes to a dead end.*

From the above account of social psychology it must be very clear that social psychology provides the meeting point of the three disciplines of psychology, sociology and anthropology.

Cultural anthropology studies the civilization of the primitive man for it is there we find the beginnings of social organization and social control through taboos, superstitions, ritual. Since much of human life and activity is interlinked with the use of tools and implements, weapons and dwellings, anthropologists seek to reconstruct the social pattern and customs of primitive people from the remains found in the ruins of ancient civilizations and cultures. Again travellers' accounts of their sojourn among primitive or strange people have yielded valuable data about the cultural patterns of those people. But all this is not so scientific. Today systematic studies have been made and the work of Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, Malinowsky and others has provided data regarding folkways, traditions, customs, family and social relationships, ways of bringing up boys and girls, religious beliefs and personal qualities valued among

* *The Cultural Background of Personality* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co), pp. 4-5.

emphasis, points of view and problems to be studied.

While psychology begins with the individual, sociology begins with the social setting, the entire social milieu of the individual. It is a study of the cultural patterns, analyses social organization and seeks to discover the nature and extent of social control through interpersonal and intergroup interaction. What are the various patterns of people, how is population distributed and how does it grow, what types of social groups and associations prevail, what are the patterns of social and cultural behaviour like customs, folkways, mores and institutions, and what types of social processes like competition, co-operation, assimilation and adjustment operate are some of the main subjects which fall within the scope of sociology. Its main concern is how society is organized, what factors make it change, what are the different patterns of social change, how problems of urbanization, delinquency, divorce, class, community and race prejudices, poverty, disease, crime, war and the like must be studied and solved and what main agencies should be used to direct and control processes of social change.

Human society is made up of a number of groups, communities and subgroups. They are interdependent and yet distinct from each other. They have their own complex structure and organization, their own history and body of traditions, customs and values. Members have different roles to play, different rights and obligations. Often there are disparities in the status of women in different groups and communities, children are differently treated and educated, male adults have different attitudes towards their families and hold different occupational places. Thus society is a very complex structure in which different groups and subgroups are interwoven. Sociology studies the different types of grouping of human beings, how their interaction brings about different patterns of social behaviour, how different social systems affect each other, and how social changes take place as a result of constant interaction.

Thus social psychology and sociology cannot help being very close to each other. Social psychology draws upon sociology for an understanding of the structure, organization and culture of societies to which individuals belong and in terms of which their social behaviour must be explained. On the other hand sociology must turn to social psychology for an explanation of

those psychological facts and factors which make for stable social organizations or for rapid changes in society. Human needs for companionship, recognition, communication, etc. are for ever seeking channels for satisfaction and to that end affecting changes in social environment. A knowledge of such needs is provided by social psychology. Sociology studies society, social psychology studies the individual in society and since the individual and society cannot exist and subsist without each other, social psychology and sociology are interdependent and very closely related to each other.

The science of *anthropology*, particularly *cultural anthropology* or *ethnology* studies the customs, institutions, and behaviour of primitive peoples. Ralph Linton has aptly remarked:

> The individual has been assigned to Psychology, society to Sociology and culture to Cultural Anthropology....It is now becoming apparent that the integration between the individual, society and culture is so close and their interaction so continuous that the investigator who tries to work with any one of them without reference to the other two soon comes to a dead end.*

From the above account of social psychology it must be very clear that social psychology provides the meeting point of the three disciplines of psychology, sociology and anthropology.

Cultural anthropology studies the civilization of the primitive man for it is there we find the beginnings of social organization and social control through taboos, superstitions, ritual. Since much of human life and activity is interlinked with the use of tools and implements, weapons and dwellings, anthropologists seek to reconstruct the social pattern and customs of primitive people from the remains found in the ruins of ancient civilizations and cultures. Again travellers' accounts of their sojourn among primitive or strange people have yielded valuable data about the cultural patterns of those people. But all this is not so scientific. Today systematic studies have been made and the work of Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, Malinowsky and others has provided data regarding folkways, traditions, customs, family and social relationships, ways of bringing up boys and girls, religious beliefs and personal qualities valued among

* *The Cultural Background of Personality* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co.), pp. 4-5.

different primitive tribes. Such studies have shown that human nature and personality assumes different patterns in different types of culture and the so-called universal and fundamental motives like hunger, sex, thirst, protection, or acquisition are not so universal and fundamental.

It is not quite correct to affirm that the anthropologist is not interested in the individual. Many studies like Radin's *Crashing Thunder* are descriptions of both individuals and groups, and bring out pointedly 'the frame of reference', that is, the cultural background of beliefs, group purposes, social ideals and the like in which individuals are brought up. Such studies reveal that the perceptions, learnings and discriminations of an individual are determined by the cultural background of his life, and the conclusions of social psychology have meaning, validity, and value only in relation to the particular culture in which the individual or group behaviour has been investigated.

That social psychology and cultural anthropology are interrelated becomes more obvious when their areas of contact are specifically mentioned. In the first place the factual data collected by anthropologists is of immense help in solving and clarifying some of the important problems of social psychology. It is the impact of anthropology that has made social psychology conscious of cultural determinants of personality and human behaviour. Social psychologists have begun to realize that the universal content of human behaviour cannot be ascertained without considering the large amount of research material made available by anthropology. Secondly, psychology may help to solve some of the problems of anthropology like those of superstitious beliefs and primitive religion. Abnormal psychology and psychoanalysis bring out the hidden meanings of primitive ways and customs. And thirdly, methods of investigation and study used by psychology are being increasingly employed by anthropology in the comparative study of cultures.

According to Kimball Young one of the commonest approaches to social psychology is to study personality as it develops in society and culture. If in our study and discussion the three broad and basic variables are personality, society, and culture, then social psychology, sociology, and anthropology belong to an interrelated system of social sciences which must draw upon each other.

Social psychology has also to draw on *physiology* and *biology*

for facts about the physiological bases of behaviour, for a better understanding of the sources of emotional excitement and of the physiological determinants of personality. Can emotional expression differ with differences in culture? Can personality be classified on the bases of physiological differences like the colour of hair, shape of the skull, size of the nose and the like? How far do endocrine glands affect personality? These are questions which social psychology needs answering with the help of physiology and biology.

In seeking to study and understand individual behaviour in the social environment, social psychology will have to rely on *abnormal psychology* also. A great many forms of social behaviour can be traced to mental aberrations and abnormalities, as for example, megalomania among leaders like Hitler. Many physical diseases have mental consequences and epileptic and syphilitic persons behave in abnormal ways. Humble ways of behaving may be applauded in India or China but condemned in America. Psychoanalytic studies of behaviour supplemented by sociological analysis may reveal unconscious motives and influences of culture Social psychology will be benefited by studies of neuroses and psychoses prevailing in certain cultural patterns. National bullying may often be due to feelings of racial inferiority feelings.

Child psychology may throw a flood of light on the problem of socialization and early social influences on child development. *Linguistics* will supply very helpful data to social psychology as an important type of social behaviour is found in the use of language in speaking and writing. Many social processes of suggestion, imitation, advertisement, propaganda, rumour, and the like depend on the use of language. Language, being a means of both communication and thinking, often helps to build social cohesiveness and solidarity.

The need and value of social psychology

Social psychology, as we have seen, studies the individual as he interacts socially with other individuals. Biosocial processes involved in this social interaction as well as the growth and development of personality as a result of such interaction is of supreme importance to social psychology. What are the basic social needs of man as a social being and how he satisfies his biogenic

and sociogenic needs through social interaction, how he develops attitudes and traits of personality, what attitudes and traits are common to all cultures, are topics of great interest to social psychology. No doubt social psychology is a science of recent origin but it has already been accepted as an independent field of study in its own right. We have already seen that though this study depends very largely on related subjects of psychology, sociology and cultural anthropology, it has its own approach and the data it presents, the knowledge and understanding of human nature it offers cannot be given by any other branch of knowledge. Our knowledge and understanding of human nature is growing fast, and while general psychology deals with behaviour in general we have disciplines like abnormal psychology, industrial psychology, and educational psychology which study individual behaviour in different specified situations. This division and specialization in the study of human behaviour is called for by the rapidly growing field of human knowledge and study and by the urgent need of studying certain aspects of the subject-matter in isolation from the rest. This in turn has stimulated further investigation and resulted in a much greater heritage of knowledge. If knowledge and understanding is a power, social psychology's value and usefulness in helping to know and understand, and later to direct, regulate and control the social behaviour of man cannot be disputed.

Recently due to rapid means of transport and communication the remotest parts of the world are now our neighbours and the need and importance of international understanding and co-operation has increased manifold. The urgency of eliminating group conflicts, racial and national, of developing backward countries, of promoting international co-operation to raise the general standards of living all over the world, and of building up a joint front against poverty, ignorance, disease, and war is being keenly felt. Such goals and programmes can be fulfilled only on the basis of a sound knowledge of man behaving under diverse social pressures and in a large variety of social situations. Social sciences like sociology and anthropology give us a great help in laying bare the social organizations and cultural patterns of several groups, nations and races inhabiting this world, but more valuable than these is the knowledge and understanding offered by social psychology as to how the individual behaves

under different social and cultural settings; and how his personality is shaped and moulded by these influences. Co-operation can best be founded on understanding, toleration and acceptance, and it may be claimed that a wider study of social psychology will help to build the foundations of toleration and acceptance among different races and groups of mankind.

Too often firmly rooted attitudes, prejudices and stereotypes prevent different groups from coming together. Too often propaganda gives a distorted version of other people, too often people in the grip of mass emotions allow themselves to do things which in their saner moments they would not dream of doing. In many cases they are victims of frustrated leadership or public opinion has been wrongly formed. Again in different communities the processes of social change vary, and to promote co-operation and cohesiveness within groups tension and conflict-producing situations have to be avoided. Social psychology with its ever growing array of facts and findings and a deep study of group dynamics will help to improve the morale and interpersonal relationships, and thus pave the way for richer and fuller programmes of social adjustments, social efficiency and happiness.

Studies of social structure and cultural differences reveal that psychologically significant variations among communities are of cultural origin. Prejudice is a negative attitude toward an individual, group or activity. Prejudices are widespread in all countries. Intercaste and intercommunity prejudices in India are as widespread as colour prejudice in America. What is happening in South Africa illustrates what deep tragedies prejudices can enact. Prejudices like other attitudes are learned and passed on from one generation to another Historical and cultural factors strengthen and harden them and groups come to be arranged in a hierarchy of levels of superiority or inferiority. The intensity of such prejudices is determined by the people's needs and frustrations. The needs and frustrations of the South African whites are responsible for the policy of *apartheid* being practised there, and economic stress and insecurity have bred intolerance of non-whites. Social psychology stresses the need of bridging social distance through favourable intergroup contacts, inter-cultural education, and reduction of prejudice through economic aid and improvement in economic and social conditions. After World

War II the prosperous and progressive countries are co-operating in a big programme of helping underdeveloped countries with technical knowledge and wherewithals to undertake large projects for growing more food, producing more consumers' goods, fighting poverty, ignorance, and disease, and raising cultural and living standards of the masses. It is presumed that such help and contacts will soften racial prejudices, remove disparities in living standards and promote international harmony and peace. Social psychology will provide knowledge and technique to build frontiers of peace and understanding among nations.

For some time past leaders all over the world have been exercised by deteriorating human relations in educational and industrial spheres. In India as elsewhere rapid strides in the expansion of educational facilities have created problems of strikes, student indiscipline and lowering of academic standards. Relations between students and teachers and between students themselves are not happy; a school college, or university is also a society and social psychology has to contribute to the understanding and solution of educational problems. Large-scale industrialization has brought to the forefront problem of human relations in factories and business houses. The labourer is no longer looked upon as a mere pair of hands but as an individual whose working conditions in terms of light, air, rest, nourishment, entertainment, health, and happiness must be duly improved. The happiness and satisfaction of the worker does not rest on light work and handsome wages but on his social relations with his colleagues and superiors, how far he is allowed to identify himself with the plant or firm and what prestige, security, and peace of mind the work provides. The social psychology of industry as of education is very much in demand, and a number of studies are available which deal with the social background of industry, discussing fundamental topics of morale, the impetus which causes men to work, and the influence of industrial work upon the mental health of the individual and the community.

Lately the concept of a welfare state has become a current coin with national planners and it is being increasingly recognized that national well-being means not only material prosperity and high standard of living but also the promotion of personal dignity, high moral tone and healthy social relations among

individuals and communities living in the country. This is essentially a problem for social psychology and leaders rightly insist that democratic ways of persuasion and discussion are better methods of solving political and economic problems than coercion and compulsion. Even when the state exercises control it strives to win popular understanding and sympathy, so that the people may be saved from fear and anxiety. It is rightly believed that if people think and feel with the Government they will lend utmost support and make great sacrifices to implement the plans and programmes of the state.

Social psychology will help us to understand the growing trends of our culture and their effect on human nature and personality. Already the cut-throat competition that prevails in our social living and the exaggerated emphasis on material luxuries have bred frustration. In the West it has led to increase in neurotic difficulties and mental ailments. India, too, is going the way of the West and there is widespread tendency to multiply our wants and pursue pleasure for its own sake. The traditional emphasis on simple living and high thinking, on spiritual values and moral ideals, as advocated by saints and seers like Buddha, Nanak, and Gandhi, no longer holds good and our only hope is that social trends, problems and situations should be studied and analysed systematically with the help of social sciences like social psychology and sociology, and on the basis of their findings, programmes and techniques of social reconstruction may be employed to ensure social change and progress in the right direction. There is a growing awareness in the country of the need and usefulness of such efforts and programmes and it is hoped that before long a larger number of institutes of social sciences and social work will be set up all over the country. In such programmes the study and applications of social psychology will have a vital part to play

A historical review

Modern social psychology has its roots in several fields of inquiry which were systematized during the nineteenth century. The ancients like Plato and Aristotle speculated about problems of social living, and in the writings of Bodin, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, and many others, there is lot of provocative thinking concerning the relation between individual and society, but their

approach was not scientific and left much to be desired.

The earliest pioneers in the field were two German scholars Steinthal and Lazarus who started a journal of *Folk Psychology* devoted to the study of language, mythology, religion and literature of primitive people. They began to apply concepts of individual mental life to races of people and to speak of 'group mind' or 'folk soul'. This led Wundt, the father of experimental psychology, to reconstruct the mental development and to understand the mental processes of people in different communities from their customs, myths, language and arts and crafts. His approach rendered great service in bringing anthropology and psychology together. Nevertheless he was individualistic but he believed that group behaviour reflected primarily the mental processes of the individual.

In France Auguste Comte was the first to emphasize that the individual cannot be understood apart from society and cannot develop without it. Emile Durkheim was primarily a sociologist for whom the individual had no existence except as a member of society and he went on to propose that a group has a mind and thinks, feels, and acts differently from the individual.

In England the evolutionists like Darwin, Spencer and Bagehot sought to apply evolutionary ideas to social development. Spencer stressed that social behaviour is to be understood as a series of adjustments to social environment, and saw the possibility of a social science studying the process by which a young person becomes progressively socialized.

But soon these early groupings of social philosophers paved the way for social psychology seeking to study individual behaviour as social interaction. Gabriel Tarde (1843-1904) stressed that imitation is the fundamental social process. It is the key of social interaction and social development. His book *The Laws of Imitation* influenced early American social psychologists like Ross who devoted a good part of his book to the various types of imitation. Le Bon (1841-1931) wrote the first book on social psychology *The Crowd* and tried to explain group behaviour by suggestion and suggestibility. He was greatly influenced by contemporary psychiatrists and thought that in crowds intelligence is suppressed and the unconscious impulses, emotions, suggestibility and the like rule the crowd behaviour. This use of psychiatric terms to explain crowd behaviour was quite original.

In the beginning of the present century two very important publications marked the birth of social psychology as an independent discipline in her own right. They were *Social Psychology* by E. A. Ross and *Introduction to Social Psychology* by William McDougall. Ross defined social psychology as the study of individual behaviour in a social environment. He was very much influenced by Tarde's theory of imitation-suggestion and elaborated both these processes to explain crowd behaviour, fashions, customs, public opinion and the like. His book is full of striking illustrations from social living to support the phenomena of imitation and suggestion. McDougall's book gained immediate popularity and was hailed as the first systematic treatise on social psychology studying individual behaviour as the basis of social life and social interaction. He was greatly influenced by evolutionists and argued that all human activities have deep, innate, inborn springs or urges. These he called 'instincts' and according to him they are the prime movers of action in both animals and men. He listed a number of instincts as the basis of group living and social interaction, and each of these instincts was associated with characteristic emotions such as flight with fear, pugnacity with anger, curiosity with wonder, self-assertion with elation and parental instinct with tender emotion. He accepted that some instincts were not associated with emotions such as construction, acquisition or gregariousness Along with these instincts he put forward 'general innate tendencies' of suggestion, imitation and sympathy which, he believed, underlie all social activity. McDougall's views were very popular for a time and helped to lay the foundation of much of the later work in social psychology.

Later there was a strong reaction against the instinct theory of McDougall. On the one hand the behaviourists sought to re-examine and re-phrase the assumptions of McDougall by bringing in 'reaction-arcs', needs, or drives and on the other anthropologists and ethnologists emphasized that culture may determine many of the activities which are called instincts. John Dewey in his book *Human Nature and Conduct* stressed that individual behaviour should be studied in its functional aspect in relation to his social environment. The biological organism in its interaction with social environment develops habits which underline and explain his social behaviour. Many psychologists

and sociologists began to question the doctrine of instincts till the publication of L. L. Bernard's book *Instinct: A Study of Social Psychology* finally demolished the case for instincts.

C. H. Cooley in his book *Human Nature and the Social Order* stressed that the individual and the society are inseparable and traced in detail how human self or personality develops in the social environment provided by the family, play group, and other primary groups; and in his later book, *Social Organization: A Study of the Larger Mind*, he brings out the great changes brought about in human personality as a result of modern social trends like urbanization, rapid transport and communication, industrialization and specialization, class conflicts and the like. G. H. Mead in his book, *Mind, Self and Society* further studied and analysed the processes of social interaction which shape and mould the self with particular reference to role-taking.

Because social interaction helps to develop common ways of thinking, feeling, and acting which are different from the ways of the individual, many thinkers were led to put forward the theory of a 'group mind'. By this they meant that society has a mind of its own and the existence of language, religion, traditions, tribal, communal or national fanaticism and the like supports the hypothesis. The seeds of the idea are to be found in Hobbes' *Leviathan* and many philosophers, psychologists and sociologists since then had played with the idea in one form or the other till William McDougall wrote *Group Mind* in 1920. For him group mind was just an abstraction of certain attitudes and beliefs from the personal mental life of individuals. Thus the common attitudes and beliefs of Indians will constitute the group mind of the Indian people.

But groups vary, multiply, and cut across each other. Do group minds intersect each other? Again social structures or group organizations do not depend on individuals but on the roles they are called upon to play. Modern social psychologists treat it as a metaphysical conception which can only hamper further growth of knowledge. F. H. Allport in *Social Psychology* (1924) pleaded that social behaviour is a means of satisfying man's biological needs and can be adequately explained by the biological and psychological process of the individual.

Among modern social psychologists there is a general consensus about their subject of study and investigation. There may be

slight differences in terminology used by them, but they all agree that social psychology is the study of the behaviour of individuals in relation to other individuals or groups. L. G. Brown in his *Social Pathology* stresses that it 'studies the unique experience of the person as his organism and social heritages interact to produce human nature.' The social psychologist is not interested in each of the two heritages by itself but in the human nature which results from the interaction of both. Murphy, Murphy and Newcomb in their *Experimental Social Psychology* think that 'social psychology is concerned with a process by which the individual organism becomes socialized, utilizes and expresses social patterns in the world about him, builds within himself the attitude and outlooks which characterize the family and neighbourhood groups, participates in community life, and leaves his small or large impress upon the personality patterns of those with whom he comes in contact.' Muzafer Sherif in *An Outline of Social Psychology* writes that it 'deals with the experience and behaviour of the individual in relation to the social stimulus situations. Interpersonal relationships, group interactions and their products, values or norms, language, art forms, institutions and technology are certainly among the major social stimuli or stimulus situations.' Kimball Young in his *Handbook of Social Psychology* says that it is 'concerned with the study of the interactional processes of human beings'. S. S. Sargent in his *Social Psychology* writes that it is 'the scientific study of persons as members of groups with emphasis on their social or interpersonal relationship'. Thus recent social psychologists have attempted to combine the 'individual approach' and the 'social approach' and to integrate the psychological and sociological-anthropological points of view as well as materials

There are three major trends in modern social psychology. In the first place with the increasing impact of cultural anthropology on this field it is being more and more clearly realized that a better and fuller understanding of individual behaviour is possible if its study is made in the context of a variety of cultures and social organizations. A comparative study of personality in different cultures will yield a fuller and richer picture of human nature. Secondly, social psychology is rapidly taking its place alongside other branches of science by the use of experimental techniques. The application of experimental methods

to group data is growing and descriptions and analyses of social behaviour are consequently becoming more accurate. This will be dealt with in greater detail in the next chapter. Thirdly, social psychology is rapidly becoming an applied science to solve, for example, the problem of improving human relations. By studying group dynamics it can improve morale and production in industry, interrelation between capital and labour, diagnose and remove causes of indiscipline in educational institutions, reduce communal tensions, lessen intergroup prejudice and contribute to international understanding and peace.

From the brief account given above the reader is likely to assume that textbooks on social psychology are all of one piece. This is not so. Some authors emphasize the purely psychological point of view, others reflect a strong sociological bias. Some authors try to present a systematic account of social behaviour without any bias or preference for certain concepts, others are wedded to definite concepts and presuppositions. Recent textbooks are mostly of the former type but earlier authors had a specific approach. McDougall's social psychology is entirely inspired by the hormic approach in general psychology, Allport is a behaviourist, J. F. Brown favours field theory and Muzafer Sherif emphasizes the strong role of culture in influencing and determining social behaviour.

Plan of the book

As is obvious social psychology is a new field of study and its area is not easy to determine with accuracy. Broadly the book will study the individual basis of social behaviour, social interaction and social learning, personality and self, social roles and status, how cultures and subcultures influence personality, the nature and structure of groups, their types and norms, group dynamics, behaviour of crowds, leadership, public opinion, fashions and fads, propaganda, media of mass communication like newspapers, radio and films, attitudes and beliefs, the nature of social conflict and prejudice, social, racial, and international prejudices, revolution and war, social control, social change and social progress. This list may seem formidable but the social drama is complex, the interplay of social forces is intermixed, and a comprehensive analysis of social phenomena cannot avoid dealing with these topics.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

BIRD, C. *Social Psychology* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co.).
KRECH, D. and CRUTCHFIELD, R. S. *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc).
LINDESMITH, A. R. and STRAUSS, A. L. *Social Psychology* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston).
LINDZEY, C. *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 2 vols. (Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc.).
DEWEY, R. and HUMBER, W. J. *The Development of Human Behaviour* (New York: Macmillan & Company).
SHERIF, M. *An Outline of Social Psychology* (New York: Harper and Brothers)
YOUNG, K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd).
KLINEBERG, OTTO, *Social Psychology* (New York: Henry Holt & Co.).
LA PIERE, R. T. and FARNSWORTH, P. R. *Social Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc.)
NEWCOMB, T. M. *Social Psychology* (London: Tavistock Publishers Ltd)
SARGENT, S. S. and WILLIAMSON, R. C. *Social Psychology* (New York: The Ronald Press Company)
BONNER, H. *Social Psychology* (New York American Book Company)
KATZ, D. and SCHANCK, R. L. *Social Psychology* (New York: John Wiley & Sons)
KUPPUSWAMY, B. *An Introduction to Social Psychology* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House)

1. A man who is unkind or one who is tender;
2. A man who is conceited or one who is appreciative of others;
3. A man who is critical of others or one who is tolerant of others;
4. A man who is vindictive or one who forgives and forgets easily;
5. A man who is touchy or one who is thick-skinned.

The questionnaire technique is not free from limitations. Meaningful questions are difficult to formulate and there is no opportunity, other than by printed word, to establish rapport. But this is offset by the great advantage of securing data from a large number of people far removed from each other. It is economical and effective.

Genetic method

Genetic or developmental method seeks to trace the growth and development of an individual behaviour pattern or an institution. The approach is historical and has yielded very fruitful data in child and educational psychology. How emotions grow, how the individual is gradually socialized through successive stages of his life, and how institutions like marriage, caste, newspapers, have grown and developed, can be best studied by the genetic or historical method. Westermarck's *History of Human Marriage* is an outstanding example of the historical approach, describing as it does the gradual and progressive evolution of the family from the ancient times to the present day. Ketkar's *History of the Caste System* is another study of the type. When society is dynamic and social change is a patent fact, the study of basic, social and cultural trends as for the influences which bring about social and cultural changes has necessarily to adopt the historical approach.

Again social behaviour also grows and matures. It was impulsive to begin with and it is only with the passage of time and experience that it acquires self-direction through social roles and norms. How it is done would be very useful to know, for it would help us to understand the individual better, and such an approach in study and investigation will be clearly genetic and historical.

Case study method is closely related to the genetic approach

if not one type of it. Its aim is to assemble data about individuals and then study what significant influences have worked on them. Clifford Shaw's *The Natural History of a Delinquent* is based on information gathered together about individuals. Such information concerned their social and economic status, their patterns of behaving and living, their habits and attitudes, and was collected from psychological tests, medical examinations, school records, interviews of neighbours and friends and observing the individuals in various situations. Records of their illnesses, detailed evaluation by friends, teachers, relatives, employers, and all who worked and lived with them, their own personal reaction to their childhood and past experiences, and their sense of values. Constructing a case history demands great skill and the persons who undertakes it must be highly trained. He should know where to seek information, what questions to ask, what evidence to reject as irrelevant or as mere opinion and what evidence to include as important. Case histories are mostly a qualitative record though it may include quantitative data as well, and they are prepared mostly by psychiatric social workers and trained psychologists engaged in clinical work.

Sociometry

Sociometry is a technique by which the structure of a group is analysed and studied. What is the nature of interpersonal relations among members, what attractions, repulsions, and indifferences characterize individuals in their daily interactions, what is the social status of individuals and how cohesive is the group, are questions which sociometric techniques attempt to answer. Each member of a group is asked to indicate which other member he would choose to work with, go to a film show with, sit next to in the class, take a partner in a game or the like, and which members he would not choose. From these data a chart is prepared showing the choices and rejections of the group. This chart is known as *sociogram*.

This technique was devised by J L Moreno. He found it very useful in many ways, for example, to find out to what extent the group is cohesive, whether there are cliques and cleavages and who the dominant personalities are. By its use individuals could be re-arranged into congenial gro[illegible] for different areas

of life and work. To begin with Moreno tried his sociometric device on prisoners and found that the most effective groups were those in which members were closely knit together by mutual likes and preferences. Later he experimented on delinquent girls of the New York State Training School and asked them to choose their companions and 'House Mother'. He saw that their preferences and rejections had definite patterns. Some girls were liked and preferred by a large number of girls and these he called 'stars', and some were not wanted or liked by anybody and these he called isolates'. He found that groups in which the majority of girls accepted and liked each other had the most effective organization.

There is a vast fund of literature on sociometry as a large number of workers have used it in several fields. Recently U. Bronfenbenner has defined sociometric test as a method for discovering, describing and evaluating social status, structure and development through measuring the extent of acceptancy or rejection among individuals in a group. It must be noted that only a test that tries to ascertain feelings of group members toward one another and to ascertain them in respect of the same criterion can be called *sociometric*. The feelings and attitudes of the testees are of prime importance, as it is on them that the validity of the whole test depends.

It is obvious that before this test can be used members of the group should have been in association for sufficient time to have formed close ties of affection and friendship or of dislike and rejection. There should be no restriction on the number of acceptances or rejections but they should be made privately, and with specific criteria indicating the conditions under which a member is prepared to work with another. Results of these tests should be used to rearrange or *restructure* the groups. This will help to stimulate group activity. The questions used should be suitable to the intellectual standard of the members of the group. With younger children it is better to use the interview method in asking questions, while with older children written or printed questionnaires may be used.

It is obvious that sociometric techniques must be very useful in studies pertaining to leadership. Modern approach is that leadership is a function of the individual and should be studied as an activity of the individual in a group, and several studies

do we acquire motive for secondary goals?

In a number of experiments with animals it has been shown that rats which were given food in a white box and not in a black box learned to prefer white boxes to black ones. And those which were given electric shocks in a white box learned to shun them. Once secondary motives have become established they continue to *function independently of the basic drives with* which they were originally associated. As new tensions arise new needs and demands appear, old ones may disappear and these new needs and demands do not derive their motivating power from primary physiological needs and demands from which they previously developed. This agrees with the doctrine of 'functional autonomy of motives' put forward by Allport.* Secondary motives acquire a functional autonomy by means of which they become independent of physioloical drives. Thus money which was originally valued because it could be exchanged for primary goals like food and shelter becomes an end in itself. We no longer need clothes to keep warm or protect our skin, but we value them for other considerations We eat to satisfy our hunger, but we nibble at nuts to sharpen our hunger, and eat a number of things for ends other than hunger such as dry fruits, lemon drops, ice cream

But are secondary motives altogether independent? We cannot consider them entirely autonomous if we realize that they are tied up with the emotional life of the individual. If they satisfy an emotional need or relieve anxiety, they are certainly connected with physiological states and cannot be described as independent of them.

Allport thinks that a habit is formed in the service of a motive, later the motive disappears or is modified, but the habit remains and shows the characteristic of a motive. He cites a *number of psychological activities that persist though the conditions* that brought about their existence are no longer present. Stuttering and tics have their origin in particular circumstances but continue to function long after these have disappeared. As an *ample of a new independent motive Allport cites the example* f a sailor who to begin with goes to sea to take a job, but tinues to yearn for the sea long after he has become

Personality: A Psychological Interpretation (New York Henry Holt)

forces working in the opposite direction. A clerk is angry because he has been detained in the office for urgent work while he had planned to take his family out in the evening. He makes mistakes in his work and it is thought that his anger is disrupting his work. It may be so, but his anger is also organizing his activity relating to his family. From another angle emotions are spread over the whole organism and therefore they direct and organize activity and behaviour in some specific direction. Experience of anger does not just occur and then disappear. It lingers and colours subsequent experiences. The excited person carries anger home with him, frets at his family, is upset at dinner and throughout the rest of the evening. His sleep too may be disturbed and the effect may last for a couple of days. Thus, a state of emotional motivation imparts an organization to behaviour and experience.

Concepts as motives

A concept is the symbolic representation we make of the common characteristics of a whole class of objects, people, or events. Concepts are generalized ideas and symbols, drawn from a number of experiences. So far we have studied innate drives and the culturally determined secondary drives which motivate human behaviour. But in order to understand social behaviour more fully we must also know what the individual's concepts of social behaviour are. We must know how he looks at his own social behaviour and also that of his fellow-beings. For too long in the West insane people were believed to be possessed by the devil and their treatment was motivated by these ideas. They were beaten to death or burnt alive. In many cultures concepts of 'God', 'freedom', 'justice', 'home' or 'motherland' are surcharged with meanings both emotional and ideational. They represent norms and dominant values of the group and provide motive forces for social behaviour.

Functional autonomy of motives

A striking thing about human motivation is that the things we strive for—our incentives and goals—often seem to have nothing to do with our basic needs. We want money, prestige, power, a new house, liveried servants. They are secondary goals because they do not satisfy a primary physiological need. How

do we acquire motive for secondary goals?

In a number of experiments with animals it has been shown that rats which were given food in a white box and not in a black box learned to prefer white boxes to black ones. And those which were given electric shocks in a white box learned to shun them. Once secondary motives have become established they continue to function independently of the basic drives with which they were originally associated. As new tensions arise new needs and demands appear, old ones may disappear and these new needs and demands do not derive their motivating power from primary physiological needs and demands from which they previously developed. This agrees with the doctrine of 'functional autonomy of motives' put forward by Allport.* Secondary motives acquire a functional autonomy by means of which they become independent of physioloical drives. Thus money which was originally valued because it could be exchanged for primary goals like food and shelter becomes an end in itself. We no longer need clothes to keep warm or protect our skin, but we value them for other considerations. We eat to satisfy our hunger, but we nibble at nuts to sharpen our hunger, and eat a number of things for ends other than hunger such as dry fruits, lemon drops, ice cream.

But are secondary motives altogether independent? We cannot consider them entirely autonomous if we realize that they are tied up with the emotional life of the individual. If they satisfy an emotional need or relieve anxiety, they are certainly connected with physiological states and cannot be described as independent of them.

Allport thinks that a habit is formed in the service of a motive, later the motive disappears or is modified, but the habit remains and shows the characteristic of a motive. He cites a number of psychological activities that persist though the conditions that brought about their existence are no longer present. Stuttering and tics have their origin in particular circumstances but continue to function long after these have disappeared. As an example of a new independent motive Allport cites the example of a sailor who to begin with goes to sea to take a job, but continues to yearn for the sea long after he has become

* *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation* (New York: Henry Holt & Co.)

prosperous. The initial motive has disappeared, the action which was a means in the beginning has become an end.

Unconscious motivation

For long psychologists and laymen believed that man is a rational animal and is capable of properly organizing and directing his activities consciously toward the satisfaction of his needs. This means that all motivation is conscious. Where this view did not succeed in explaining human behaviour, explanation was sought in habits, suggestion or imitation. Freud stressed that most of our motives function outside the limits of our awareness. We may have little difficulty in explaining why we do what we do, but our explanations do not take into account all the factors involved in our motivation. Professor Nath has genuine difficulty in accompanying his wife to a shopping trip. Not that he grudges her money, or that she is extravagant, or that he does not like it. He wishes to but somehow he feels upset or embarrassed. He himself does not know why though he offers excuses like indisposition, fatigue, or some urgent reading to do. Freud claims that psychoanalysis will reveal that his action is perfectly purposive and meaningful. Maybe that he feels inferior in making or advising purchases, is neglected by shopkeepers or feels useless during shopping, but he is not aware of these motives and these work independently of conscious direction. Freud was very emphatic that a man's behaviour can be completely understood only when unconscious motives have also been laid bare and warned against accepting much of the concious motivation of social behaviour at its face value. This view does not go against the functional autonomy of motives discussed earlier. On the contrary it supports the view that motives conscious or unconscious can work independently of how they came into being. We all use repression to some extent, that is, we unconsciously 'forget' certain disturbing events or experiences. Professor Nath repressed some unpleasant experience he had while accompanying his wife for shopping and sought adjustment by offering other reasons. All this is done at the unconscious level and he is not aware of his real motives.

Habits

William James described habit as the enormous flywheel of

society and John Dewey considered it as 'the key to social psychology'. It includes general attitudes, outlooks, purposes, interests, and has a strong motivational character. The term habit is used for organized and learned responses which are repeated automatically. Taking tea at four in the evening is a habit and it enables us to meet our need in our social environment. The clothes we wear and the way we wear them, our work, food, rest, sleep, and our entire daily routine are matters of habit. What we call culture is to a large extent our habitual patterns of eating, dressing, working, talking to and dealing with friends, relations and fellowmen.

Hindus have a habit of taking off their shoes before entering the kitchen, of washing their hands before, and their mouths after, each meal, of washing daily, and the like. All those individuals who conform indicate their acceptance of the community and its culture. Of course there are individual and regional variations, but even then every culture has an overall framework consisting of a number of habits covering certain situations. Indians when receiving guests at home come out to welcome them, fold their hands in greeting them, offer them the best seat and make them comfortable in every way. There are slight variations—some embrace their guests, others only salute with one hand and still others give a warm handshake, but the general pattern remains the same. Americans chew gum or play golf to cope with their tensions, Indians chew betel nuts and loll. Some of these habits assume functional autonomy and are indulged in for their own sake, like casual reading, smoking, betel chewing or solving crossword puzzles.

Conflict of motives

When two drives push and pull the individual in two different directions at the same time, we experience what is called a *conflict*. Conflict within the individual is usually a clash of social motives. Two patterns of goal-directed behaviour organized in a social setting oppose each other. An individual plays many social roles in life—interpersonal roles and group roles in his family, school, office, clubs, and so on. Often people shift from one role to another giving up one type of behaviour for another, as they move from one social situation to another. But sometimes their roles clash A young man wishes to marry a

girl from outside his community and his father does not like it and is faced with a conflict in his interpersonal relations. He may resolve this conflict by giving up one of the roles. Or the conflict may be between an interpersonal role and a group role as when young Indians were called upon to boycott Government activities by the Congress party of which they were members and were checked by their fathers who were Government officials. Some of them consistently supported the Congress and others withdrew as consistently when their relations were involved. Or it may be that the individual is playing two roles in the same group and these clash with each other. In a joint family many newly married sons find it difficult to reconcile the claims and wishes of their wives and parents at the same time.

Such conflicts cause frustration and anxiety and may take place at the unconscious level.

Theories of motivation

Philosophers, poets, saints, and scientists have sought to define human nature and reduce human behaviour to some basic universal constant characteristics or units. While there is wide agreement regarding human growth and development we have several theories regarding basic constants of human behaviour. It is generally admitted that human nature is variable and capable of modification under social and cultural conditions, but several attempts have been made to postulate units of activity such as reflexes, instincts, habits, attitudes, sentiments, motives, needs or drives. Since these attempts have played an important part in the development of social psychology we may as well study them in greater detail and critically. Some of these have already been referred to in the first chapter.

The instinct theory

The traditional belief that God has given man soul and intelligence was replaced by evolutionists like Darwin and Spencer by the concept of heredity as the origin of human intelligence and behaviour. The difference between men and animals was one of degree and not of kind. Men often behave like beasts and animals are capable of learning like men. William James claimed that man has more instincts than any other animal and made out a long list. He added, however, that instincts can be modified by habits.

But it was William McDougall, who in his *Social Psychology* published in 1908 built a completely coherent system of social psychology upon the instinct hypothesis. His definition of instinct is more comprehensive. He regards it as an innate inherited tendency to perceive and pay attention to certain objects, to experience an emotional excitement upon perceiving such an object, and to act in regard to it in a particular manner. Thus an instinct has three aspects—cognition (knowing), affection (feeling), and conation (acting) Instincts, according to McDougall, are the equipment by which man perceives certain stimuli, experiences certain emotions, and acts in a certain way. These innate tendencies are the prime movers of all human activity. Every train of thought and every bodily activity owes its origin and progress to some instinct.

According to McDougall each instinct has an emotion as its core so that the arousal of the instinct means the arousal of its characteristic emotion too. In a threatening situation man tries to run and escape and this tendency is accompanied by the emotion of fear. It is fear that sustains the act of running and escaping. McDougall distinguishes between *primary* and *blended* emotions. Fear, anger, lust, tender emotion, disgust, elation, etc. belong to the former and awe, gratitude, hatred, scorn, admiration, jealousy, shame, revenge, etc. belong to the latter class Then there are *derived* emotions which are complicated by memmory such as hope, disappointment.

Intelligence, reason, will, and ability to learn are not peculiar to man. They are found in animals also and work within instincts.

McDougall put forward the following list of instincts as final and believed that they have an important bearing in social life·

1. Escape (fear).
2. Repulsion (disgust).
3. Curiosity (wonder)
4. Pugnacity (anger).
5. Self-assertion (elation on display).
6. Self-abasement (negative self-feeling)
7. Parental instinct (tender emotion).
8. Sex (lust).
9. Food.
10. Gregariousness

11. Acquisitiveness.
12. Constructiveness.

The desire for company and group formation, the desire for approval, and migration to cities, etc. are traced to the instinct of gregariousness. Law courts, police, and army are traced to self-preservation and pugnacity. Hoarding, capitalism are traced to acquisitive instinct. The acquisition of knowledge, research in science, discoveries and explorations as well as eavesdropping are attributed to curiosity. The institution of family is based on sex, parental instinct, and acquisition. Clothes, fashions, fancy toilets, purdah are accounted for by the sex instinct. Poetry, music, art, and religion, are also traced to the same instinct. Love, charity, benevolence, justice, social service, and other activities to uplift the suppressed and depressed classes like children, women, slaves, or poor people are traced to parental instinct with its tender and protective impulses. The desire for wielding power in political and social life, for acquiring name and fame in literature, science or social reform and for manipulating things in educational and social institutions is traced to self-assertion.

Along with these specific tendencies McDougall put forward some general tendencies which are also innate and universal, for example, imitation, suggestion, sympathy, play, forming habits.

McDougall worked out his theory in a very attractive manner and it became popular very quickly. The theory was used as a working hypothesis in many fields of inquiry. *The Instinct of Workmanship* by Thorstein Veblen, *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War* by W. Trotter, *Instincts in Industry* by O. Tead are some of the important works published before and during World War I, using instinct in fields other than psychology. But it was going too far and some psychologists realized that the term was being used to ridiculous extremes. L. L. Bernard listed some 6,000 urges or activities to which the term 'instinct' was applied. Two outspoken critics of the instinct theory were Knight Dunlap and J. B. Watson. They insisted that most human behaviour is greatly affected by learning and therefore is not innate. Watson showed that many fears are acquired and so are numerous activities like walking, standing, crawling.. Psychologists like R. S. Woodworth found that the term is being used

very loosely and employed instead the term 'mechanism' to explain behaviour or activity, and the impulse prodding it he called 'drive' likening it to power that makes a machine operate. The two cannot be sharply marked off as a mechanism, once started, can furnish its own drive. A youth forced to participate in a programme of compulsory games may soon begin to like it and play with enthusiasm. Habits contain their own motivating power and exert a drive toward their repetition. Therefore he argued that all motivating power does not originate in instincts. Thus Bernard, Dunlap, Watson and Woodworth overthrew the instinct doctrine in psychology. On the other hand anthropologists showed fairly conclusively by citing examples from all over the world that human urges and behaviour differ according to the social and cultural conditions in which people live. H. R. Rivers gave the example of Murray Islanders in the Torres Straits who had no love for their children, where adoption is common and children do not know their parents. If a family has too many children a child may be put to death. He argued that love of one's own children, therefore, is not instinctive. Margaret Mead found in the Manus tribe of New Guinea that children are brought up by their fathers instead of mothers, and Ralph testifies that in a tribe in Madagascar if a divorced woman remarries she has to surrender the first three children from her second marriage to her former husband. Several anthropologists like Franz Boas and A. Goldenweiser report that fighting is not known in some primitive tribes and quarrels are settled by contests of singing or other forms of community work. Many social psychologists report that they found no competition or rivalry in many tribes. Thus the so-called instincts differ widely form group to group depending on the type of culture. If instincts are innate, relatively unchangeable universal behaviour in a species, it will be difficult to apply the term to human behaviour which is so variable and modifiable. No wonder that psychologists have mostly dropped its use.

Again McDougall has drawn the distinction between knowledge, feeling, and action aspects of instincts a little too sharply. After all they are merely aspects of a single process. As Ginsberg points out 'Feeling and conation in particular are more closely connected. Thus a feeling of displeasure is an incipient tendency to remove it, a feeling of pleasure is an incipient ten-

dency to preserve it.'* From McDougall's account it appears that the three aspects are independent units while instinctive activity is a response of the organism as a whole. His view of the relation of instinct and emotion is also open to criticism. Nobody disputed that the two are closely connected, but to say that emotion is the affective side of instinct and that every instinct has a peculiar emotion attached to it is not acceptable to all. Some instincts like nest-building do not have any single emotion peculiar to them. Or the same emotion may be found in several types of behaviour. Fear is found in flight, concealment, crying, silence, shamming dead, and so on.

These instincts are just class names for different types of behaviour and psychologists doubt if there is any advantage in retaining them. Already many instances have been cited to show that human behaviour is not merely due to inherited instinctive tendencies, but largely due to social tradition and cultural conditions. Human nature is socially acquired is a statement abundantly true.

Freud's theory of instincts

The approach of Freud is biological and he bases all motivation on various instincts like sex, hunger, thirst, and aggressiveness. Most important is the sex instinct or *libido.* Libido is best described as a drive energy, 'striving', pulsating, amorphous force 'which is largely sexual and unconscious, and all social and emotional life and experience of man is rooted in it. Sex is at work right from infancy, and sucking, playing with genitals, kissing, and the like so commonly found among infants, are early expressions of the sex instinct. Freud goes on to affirm that all acts, all thoughts, all dreams, all mistakes like the slips of the tongue are caused by this unconscious sex impulse. He also postulates life and death instincts, the former he identifies with the libido and represents the creative and constructive urges and the latter stands for destructive tendencies to do harm to things and persons and to rebel against authority. Wars and persecutions are accounted for by the innate aggressive urge. The self and sex instincts motivate constructive and creative activities. They bring people together in family, caste, community, and nation. The death instinct creates hatred and hostility between

* M. Ginsberg, *The Psychology of Society* (London: Methuen), p. 7.

individuals and groups. The holding back or suppression of these instincts is unhealthy and the major problem of motivation is the concealment of these innate urges. The exclusion of unpleasant or painful ideas and impulses from consciousness or from action is called *repression*. These two concepts, repression and unconscious, are a very valuable contribution to the understanding of human motivation. They show that there are stimuli which reach us and affect us without our being fully aware of them, and that there is a dynamic process working outside consciousness. Unfulfilled desires unconsciously affect the adjustments of individuals to parents, wives, friends, and others.

Freud also put forward the *theory of pleasure and pain principle* and *reality principle*. We all know that we do what is pleasurable and avoid what is unpleasant. According to Freud in the evolution of social behaviour the pleasure principle is gradually replaced by the reality principle. Young people do not wish to rise early, go out for a walk or take exercise, because it is not pleasant. This is the pleasure principle. In course of time they learn to do so because efficiency and health needed for earning livelihood demand it. This is the reality principle. Often the transition from the former to the latter principle is smooth but sometimes it suffers from inhibitions and neurosis develops. There is no doubt that for education and social training this transition should be as smooth as possible.

Freud's ideas are interesting and have opened a new and vast area of hidden ideas, wishes, and impulses which influence our behaviour without our awareness, but all this is not based on any scientific investigation. It is highly speculative.

The Concept of Needs

We have tried to explain social behaviour in terms of physiological and psychological needs, and to interpret social motives as needs. The term "need" is borrowed from physiology by way of clinical psychology and personality research. A need is, basically, a lack of something vital or important to the organism — a deficit. We all have needs for water, oxygen, warmth and nourishment. We also have needs to be active, to rest and to communicate. There is great interpersonal variation in the strength of these needs. The psychological needs are an extension of this basic idea and there is greater variation in their strength and

scope. Physiological needs are said to be very vital for survival but the so-called psychological needs are no less vital and have long range implications which affect survival. How many people commit suicide rather than face social disgrace, resort to fasting to death rather than give up their cause or resign their job and starve rather than give up their rights, shows that psychological needs are no less vital. But does the concept of *need* explain behaviour? Many people think it is just a label to indicate that everyone does these things, but needs refer to goals and types of behaviour without which life would cease to be normal and growth would be blocked.

Other theories

Mention has already been made of *habits* as dynamic and compelling motives to behaviour. They are persistent and demand certain kinds of activity to continue. Dewey maintained that they form our affective desires, will, and self. They rule our thoughts and determine complex relationship between the individual and his social environment, as for example, when we speak of 'a habit of mind', or of a 'habitual trouble-shooter', or of one's being 'habitually conservative'. The term habit indicates a degree of stability and perseverance of relationship between the person and his environment and in a general sense includes attitudes, traits and the like.

In understanding social behaviour the term habit is very useful to denote acts which are fusions of attitudes and traits, as for example, we say that a person is habitually suspicious or afraid (attitudes), and that a person is habitually prompt or honest (traits). Thus habits acquire motivational power. A consideration of bad habits like smoking, drinking, will show their great impelling power.

While Freud and psychoanalysts' hold that the motives of an individual are permanently affected by the early experiences, satisfactions or frustrations, of childhood, Allport believes that his motives have no functional connection with the past, cannot be understood solely in terms of early satisfactions and frustrations and are fully capable of functioning independently.

Allport's theory of 'functional autonomy of motives' has already been discussed. Adult motives sustain themselves and bear little relation to the physiological primary needs from which they

arose. A hack writer writes for a livelihood, but after achieving economic security he continues to write. What was undertaken as a means to the fulfilment of a primary need has become a powerful master motive. But as has already been pointed out such motives may come to be associated with emotional needs. The person may have developed an enthusiasm and taste for writing. Public appreciation may sharpen his zeal for writing and boost his ego. Therefore, instead of calling these motives independent and autonomous, their relation with learning and emotions, with other psychological processes and latent capacities should be studied.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

YOUNG, K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd)

BIRD, C. *Social Psychology* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co)

MCDOUGALL, W. *Introduction to Social Psychology* (London: Methuen)

GINSBERG, M. *The Psychology of Society* (London: Methuen)

LINDGREN and BURNE, *Psychology: An Introduction to Human Behaviour* (New York: John Wiley & Sons).

SMITH and SMITH, *The Behaviour of Man* (New York, Henry Holt & Co)

DEWEY and HUMBER. *The Development of Human Behaviour* (London Macmillan).

KLINEBERG, OTTO *Social Psychology* (New York Henry Holt & Co)

CHAPTER IV

ADJUSTMENT, FRUSTRATION AND CONFLICT

LIFE MEANS continuous adjustment to changes in the physical and social environment. It is not enough to know about human motives and how they function; we must know how people satisfy their motives and even whether they satisfy them or remain frustrated. We have, therefore, to think in terms of a person's adjustment to his environment. Adjustment is an all-inclusive term meaning relationship between an individual and his environment through which his needs are satisfied in accordance with social demands. It includes traits of behaviour and motives for behaviour as well as the adjustments made with those traits and motives. But adjustments are not easy and simple to achieve; they are complex and complicated and depend on a number of interacting elements. Obviously similar situations demanding adjustment are dealt with by different individuals in a variety of ways, and the different adjustments will differ widely in effectiveness.

It is a common fact of human existence that adjustments are often blocked and motives are often frustrated. When progress toward a goal is checked and there is an underlying tension unresolved, we have frustration. The consequences of frustration are many and varied. It may breed hostility and anger, destructive and aggressive impulses, delinquent and anti-social behaviour. Or it may lead to silence, restraint and withdrawal. Many people take shelter in radical ideologies like communism or revolutionary movements like anti-segregation because of intense frustration. Others may develop and preach hatred for the established order in society. Thus frustration breeds intense emotional states. But it may also lead people to discover new ways of satisfying their needs. to revise their knowledge and thinking, and to struggle more fiercely against circumstances which cause frustration. Lives of many great men like Nehru,

Gandhi, and Buddha, are records of human struggle against, and victory over, strong frustrations, and the history of developing nations shows how large groups struggled against heavy odds and did not allow frustrations to dampen their spirit. Wars, communal riots, racial prejudice, class conflicts and industrial strikes are as much the result of frustration as religious behaviour, fasting, non-violence movement, or movement for social reform and community development. Adjustments to frustration vary with individuals and groups and they so affect people as to influence their adjustments to successive frustrations. Some nations know no other way of overcoming their frustrations than war, as for example, China, and others like India will explore other means like negotiations to resolve their frustrations.

Sources of frustration

All behaviour is goal-directed. With biogenic motives the goals are relatively fixed; a thirsty person needs water and a hungry person needs food. But sociogenic motives are more complex and flexible. The need for status can be satisfied in many ways, by social eminence, political power, high scholarship or artistic skill. The goals must be achieved if the motive is to be satisfied. If it is not satisfied we speak of a frustrated motive or a frustration.

Each individual frequently experiences thwartings, failures, and disappointments while seeking to satisfy his needs, impulses, and desires. These frustrations may be due to certain obstacles from the environment which prevent the attainment of the goal. Secondly, the causes of frustration may be found in the person himself; his inadequacies, handicaps, or disabilities may make the goal distant. Thirdly, the individual may have motivational conflict within him so that the satisfaction of one goal prevents the satisfaction of another. Let us consider these sources in detail.

Physical obstacles from the environment

The most obvious and simplest type of obstacles are presented by the physical environment. In famine-striken areas people are compelled to go without food and their hunger needs are frustrated by the absence of food just as people lost in the sea or a forest are. The jackal was frustrated because of the physical obstacle that the grapes were too high for his jump. A prisoner

is frustrated in solitary confinement as his need for company is not fulfilled. Breakdowns of cars on the road, non-availability of a suitable train in times of sudden need, physical distance of dear and near ones, are common obstacles to the satisfaction of our needs and motives.

Some of the physical obstacles are the result of social regulation of behaviour. Silence is enjoined in a library, the impulse to spit is prohibited in a hospital.

Obstacles from the social environment

Frustrations from the social environment are strong and persistent. We all desire to be appreciated, loved and respected, but other people in our society, family, or club do not respond. There are wide differences in economic status, social prestige, caste status, and the like, and they obstruct the satisfaction of our social needs. Customs, traditions, regulations, taboos and rituals add to the social obstacles in fulfilling our desires for free association, security, esteem, and self-actualization. In socially more rigid communities like Hindus almost everything from food and dress to marriage and association is predetermined and frustrations are many and deep. Growing children not yet initiated into the ways and codes of the community feel frustrated at every step in life but even adults who are conversant with such codes and customs feel frustrated when, for example, in industry people are favoured not for hard work but for belonging to the caste of their employer or people are selected for promotion not for their ability and diligence but for their sociability and good looks.

In some broken homes children may not get the love and companionship which they need from their parents, they may be uncertain how they will be cared for, and they may feel ashamed because of their parents' separation. They may be frustrated in their needs for social and economic security and for a feeling of personal worth.

Unemployment, lack of security in employment, inadequate wages, shabby treatment by employers, lack of opportunities for recreation and social intercourse and the like, cause widespread frustrations in modern society. Perhaps economic conditions, soaring prices and taxes, black market and inadequate wages cause more frustration than any other single factor. But in large cities the housing difficulty in small villages, the lack of recrea-

tional facilities and the consequent boredom, and the absence of reasonable freedom in regimented authoritarian social systems frustrations are no less annoying and painful.

Krech and Crutchfield in stressing the role of society and cultural mores in frustration point out that often 'the very needs which a particular culture itself induces are thwarted by the structures and institutions of that society'.* For example among Hindus young people are exhorted to follow punctiliously the highest codes of honour and morality and yet to obey the orders of parents most scrupulously. The two may not coincide. All men are equal in the eyes of God and morality but there are rigid caste and communal discriminations. That such discrepancies between ideals, values, and norms on the one hand, and daily practice of deceit and lying on the other, are widely prevalent in almost every society and culture does not mean that they do not cause frustrations among people.

Internal psychological difficulties

These arise generally from the mental make-up and power of the individual. Some people aim too high and their ambitions are beyond their capacity. People differ widely in their powers to cope with the problems that beset them, and many are frustrated by the lack of ability to solve them. When people are frustrated because they push their desires and expectations far beyond their actual needs and what they are capable of obtaining, the cause of the frustration is within themselves. In education, we are told that motivation should match maturation and young people should be stimulated only to those activities for which they have physical, mental and emotional readiness. Otherwise frustration and defeat will follow.

In this connection the concept of the *level of aspiration* is very convenient and important in understanding human motivation and frustration in a variety of ways. It means the standard the individual sets and uses to judge the success or failure of his performance. It is the level of performance which an individual believes he is capable of achieving, and is largely determined by the goals he has acquired through learning. Social groups directly and indirectly prescribe certain standards of perform-

* *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc), p. 52.

is frustrated in solitary confinement as his need for company is not fulfilled. Breakdowns of cars on the road, non-availability of a suitable train in times of sudden need, physical distance of dear and near ones, are common obstacles to the satisfaction of our needs and motives.

Some of the physical obstacles are the result of social regulation of behaviour. Silence is enjoined in a library, the impulse to spit is prohibited in a hospital.

Obstacles from the social environment

Frustrations from the social environment are strong and persistent. We all desire to be appreciated, loved and respected, but other people in our society, family, or club do not respond. There are wide differences in economic status, social prestige, caste status, and the like, and they obstruct the satisfaction of our social needs. Customs, traditions, regulations, taboos and rituals add to the social obstacles in fulfilling our desires for free association, security, esteem, and self-actualization. In socially more rigid communities like Hindus almost everything from food and dress to marriage and association is predetermined and frustrations are many and deep. Growing children not yet initiated into the ways and codes of the community feel frustrated at every step in life but even adults who are conversant with such codes and customs feel frustrated when, for example, in industry people are favoured not for hard work but for belonging to the caste of their employer or people are selected for promotion not for their ability and diligence but for their sociability and good looks.

In some broken homes children may not get the love and companionship which they need from their parents, they may be uncertain how they will be cared for, and they may feel ashamed because of their parents' separation. They may be frustrated in their needs for social and economic security and for a feeling of personal worth.

Unemployment, lack of security in employment, inadequate wages, shabby treatment by employers, lack of opportunities for recreation and social intercourse and the like, cause widespread frustrations in modern society. Perhaps economic conditions, soaring prices and taxes, black market and inadequate wages cause more frustration than any other single factor. But in large cities the housing difficulty in small villages, the lack of recrea-

tional facilities and the consequent boredom, and the absence of reasonable freedom in regimented authoritarian social systems frustrations are no less annoying and painful.

Krech and Crutchfield in stressing the role of society and cultural mores in frustration point out that often 'the very needs which a particular culture itself induces are thwarted by the structures and institutions of that society'.* For example among Hindus young people are exhorted to follow punctiliously the highest codes of honour and morality and yet to obey the orders of parents most scrupulously. The two may not coincide. All men are equal in the eyes of God and morality but there are rigid caste and communal discriminations. That such discrepancies between ideals, values, and norms on the one hand, and daily practice of deceit and lying on the other, are widely prevalent in almost every society and culture does not mean that they do not cause frustrations among people.

Internal psychological difficulties

These arise generally from the mental make-up and power of the individual. Some people aim too high and their ambitions are beyond their capacity. People differ widely in their powers to cope with the problems that beset them, and many are frustrated by the lack of ability to solve them. When people are frustrated because they push their desires and expectations far beyond their actual needs and what they are capable of obtaining, the cause of the frustration is within themselves. In education, we are told that motivation should match maturation and young people should be stimulated only to those activities for which they have physical, mental and emotional readiness. Otherwise frustration and defeat will follow

In this connection the concept of the *level of aspiration* is very convenient and important in understanding human motivation and frustration in a variety of ways. It means the standard the individual sets and uses to judge the success or failure of his performance. It is the level of performance which an individual believes he is capable of achieving, and is largely determined by the goals he has acquired through learning. Social groups directly and indirectly prescribe certain standards of perform-

* *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology* (New York McGraw Hill Book Company Inc), p. 52.

ance, industries demand certain levels of achievement, and work groups exercise powerful pressure on individuals to keep close to the average level of the group in performing assigned tasks. In rigidly organized social communities the standard of social functions together with their financial aspects are definitely and clearly laid down. In some castes how many dresses and sweets and how much money is to be given by the parents of the girl to the parents of the boy at the time of betrothal is precisely indicated. Now when there is a disparity between the level of aspiration and the level of actual achievement, the individual suffers from frustration due to his inability to achieve goals prescribed by himself or the community. Too many parents in India have very high aspirations for their children without any consideration of their abilities. Frustration and defeat is all that they reap. Some discrepancy between the two is natural and inevitable, but if it is large serious frustration is bound to occur. In modern civilized life our social environment serves to whet our appetite for wealth, for luxuries of life, and for display, but most of us do not know how to secure or earn these. That is why frustration has come to be a serious problem of social life in our age.

Motivational conflict

Frustration occurs in the individual as a result of the blocking of motives either by direct blocking, deprivation, or by conflict of two or more lines of motivated behaviour. Conflict within the individual is usually a clash of social motives—patterns of goal-directed behaviour organized in a social setting. An individual plays many social roles in life, and as has been pointed out in the last chapter, a common cause of frustration is a conflict between interpersonal role and a group role, or between two interpersonal roles in the same group, and so on.

Kurt Lewin has identified three different ways in which motives can come into conflict with one another: *approach-avoidance, approach-approach,* and *avoidance-approach.**

Approach-avoidance conflicts are experienced when we are attracted and repelled by the same goal. Too often the same goal presents attractive as well as repulsive features and the individual is in a dilemma what to do. A young man from a

* K. Lewin, *A Dynamic Theory of Personality* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc.).

very orthodox family is invited to a dinner at a modern hotel. He has been brought up in a family which looks down upon non-vegetarian food served in chinaware outside the kitchen. Nor has he ever eaten with shoes on with people of other castes and communities. He, therefore, looks upon such an invitation with anxiety if not alarm that he would lose his caste and incur the displeasure of his parents for indulging in a dinner which is considered impure and irreligious in his family. On the other hand he does not wish to look old-fashioned and backward in the eyes of his friends. The attitudes and values of his parents have become his own and he is caught between the desire to be called modern and such orthodox attitudes and values. The first attracts him and the second frightens him. In a way this type of conflict is most difficult to solve, because the attitudes and values which obstruct his behaviour have been adopted by him through social training in childhood as his very own, that is, they have been internalized. And it is most difficult to avoid such obstacles.

Approach-approach conflict is a conflict between two equally attractive choices. Should I go to see a picture with a girl friend or play a tennis match with a prominent player of the college? This type of conflict may also be understood as *double-approach-avoidance* conflict. Girls in India have to face this type of conflict very often. Rita is a bright student in the college and is very keen to take a postgraduate degree. It has always been her ambition to qualify for economic independence. But there is a prospect of marriage in a very respectable family and to a young man who seems to have everything a girl may aspire to in marriage, but who insists on immediate marriage. It appears that she has to choose one of the two attractive alternatives and is faced by an approach-approach conflict. But each alternative is linked with a penalty. If she selects the goal of the college degree and continues to study she has to forego a tempting offer of marriage which she may or may not get again, and if she chooses marriage she will never get the degree she has so ardently desired all her life. So the element of avoidance is there.

Avoidance-approach conflict is involved when we are faced with two unpleasant alternatives, two negative goals, which we wish to avoid. A student must burn midnight oil and grind for the coming examination or face the ignominy of failure. A wife

must put up with the temper and taunts of her bullying husband or face the dissolution of her marriage. In such a conflict the individual is between the devil and the deep sea. In such conflicts usually two types of behaviour are in evidence. In the first place he may yield to an attitude of vacillation. The more he thinks of one of them the more repelling and distasteful it appears to him. Goals, as a rule, become stronger if one gets closer to them. So he withdraws and thinks of the other negative goal. On approaching the second goal he finds it no less repelling. Thus he hesitates between the two and his mind is in a virtual see-saw state. Secondly, he may think of leaving the field as Lewin puts it, that is, he may try to leave the conflict situation. He may argue that after all the examination is not so much a calamity and with the help of the teacher he can pull through. He did so well in the lower classes and with a little effort he may just pass. Or he may persuade himself that even success in the examination is not going to help him get a job and so many people fail in the examination and yet succeed in life. So failure is not so great a tragedy as he felt. Or he may just run away from home and thus avoid the conflict situation. Or he may refuse to think of the situation and sit back day-dreaming of the carefree days of childhood. Some of these escaping devices will be discussed hereinafter.

The different types of conflicts have been explained with the help of very simple examples, but in actual life conflicts are not so simple as that. There are many goals and some of them are very complex. For example in organizing a function we not only wish to seek prestige but also to put up a better show than our rivals, we have also to see that we spend less and please more people, we may have to favour certain people in making purchases and may wish to invite certain people in particular, because we have some other goals also in view. We may have to please certain local officers and also to whitewash some unfavourable opinions circulated against us. Thus several motives intermix and colour each other and there are several undercurrents of approach and avoidance. Because each goal has both advantages and disadvantages several conflicting situations arise. The positive and negative goals are of varying strengths and intensity depending on their psychological distance from the individual.

Effects of frustration

The several effects of a state of frustration have been described in the beginning of this chapter. We may now enumerate some of them in concrete form.

In the first place frustration is characterized by *anxiety* and *hostility*. Whenever the satisfaction of our needs is threatened by frustration we have a feeling of insecurity and anxiety. In modern social life man acquires many needs but society does not guarantee the satisfaction of such needs, and many people live in constant anxiety that these needs may be frustrated. He also feels hostility towards the frustrating conditions. When a candidate for employment is refused a job he tears the letter communicating refusal and throws it in a dustbin. He may curse the employer, abuse the capitalist class, or even break some of his own things in a fit of hostility.

Anxiety is often diffuse and vague and is aroused by situations which are not clear. It is also aroused by concern about the future and how other people will treat us. We all plan, and strive for security, but we can never be sure because all conditions are not under our control. Thus future conditions and relations with others are a constant source of anxiety. Often anxiety leads to behaviour which has nothing to do with the anxiety situation. Feeling irritated, talking back, or needlessly arguing, are common symptoms of a person suffering from anxiety. Some anxiety is normal and healthy for it helps us to plan for the future and pay due regard to the rights and feelings of others. It leads us to work on problems that would otherwise be ignored and is essential for efficient functioning. But anxiety which is disproportionate to the perceived threat and which may lead to several kinds of irrational behaviour is unhealthy or even neurotic.

Frustration leads to hostility and aggression which also produces anxiety. Whenever young people are restrained, whenever our plans are obstructed or when the energies of our wants and motives are blocked, they turn to hostility and aggression. When, for example, one is engaged in removing the spark plugs in his car and finds them hard to get out his frustration makes him angry, he may kick the car, curse or throw away his wrench. Most delinquents and criminals are frustrated who are taking out their frustration on society. Other people do not accept them

socially or recognize their worth, and they develop hostility toward society and indulge in anti-social activities or try to undermine the established social institutions. Frustration leads to aggression. The aggressive and hostile tendencies of many people may show themselves in such activities as fault-finding, opposition to every move or indifference to social activities. Children who are brought up under strict discipline will treat others strictly, break out in serious misbehaviour or withdraw from all situations. But sometimes hostility toward frustrating conditions can bring about very wholesome results. When social and economic conditions are so bad as to block justice, freedom, growth and happiness of the masses, an intelligent hostility leading to aggressive compaign against governmental control to remedy such frustrating conditions is very commendable. As has already been pointed out some of the great names in history like Shivaji, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Lajpat Rai, Gandhi, and Nehru fought against economic and political disabilities and frustrations and brought about improvement in the life of the masses.

Thus the consequences of frustration are not always bad. Frustration is associated with tension, unhappiness and misery, but its effects depend on what may be termed a frustration-tolerance of the individual. Some people are just 'floored' by their frustrations and give way to depression, inaction and helplessness. Others intensify their effort to overcome them, reorganize their understanding and thinking of the problem and modify both their goals and plans of action.

Aggression and hostility are, generally, not tolerated or permitted in organized society except of course in sports and athletic activities. That is why most of the above-mentioned great men were persecuted by the foreign government. Society too does not approve of aggressively hostile behaviour and condemns it as boorish, unrefined, and even uncivilized. Often hostility and aggression when resented and disapproved lead to greater and stronger hostility and aggression.

Many of the social troubles arise from expressions of aggression by one person against another or one group against another, as in wars, communal riots, or racial conflicts. It has been argued that hostility and aggression of this sort is usually 'displaced', that is, directed against objects and persons not

necessarily related logically to the frustrating situation. Thus children who are frustrated at home by over-strict discipline of the parents relieve their hostility by acting aggressively outside the home or in the school. A person rejected for employment by Government agencies may condemn Government policies, quarrel with his friends or even beat his wife and children. Thus the objects of hostility and aggression are unconnected with the original thwarting and source of frustration. In large towns social disparities and conflicts, the vast gulf between the high and the low, economic insecurities and difficulties of life, and other conditions which prevent the satisfaction of basic needs cause frustration-aggression of deep and intense types. People cannot give direct expression to it nor are they fully aware of the causes of such problems and difficulties. Law, custom, socially accepted decencies of life and the like do not let them give vent to their hostility and aggression within their group. So they in a way generalize their aggression or displace it to members of outgroups and any move to express resentment or protest against other races, groups or countries finds their ready support. That is why it is always easy to organize protest meetings, processions and strikes in urban and industrial areas A study carried out in America in 1930 demonstrated that the number of lynchings were in inverse proportion to the prices of cotton. When cotton prices rose the number of lynchings fell, and when the prices fell the number of lynchings went up Economic frustrations caused displaced hostility and aggression against an outgroup.

Expressions of hostility and aggression vary from person to person and group to group In modern urbanized industrial societies with increased opportunities for display and aggrandizement, life is fast and everybody is running to do much in less time, and therefore frustrations are deep and widespread A slight provocation sparks off a riot or a protest procession. In socially stable and rigid groups where the place, vocation and status of each member is clearly marked and where standards of conduct are well defined, every person knows what is expected of him or her and frustrations are comparatively fewer. One indication of this fact is that suicides, divorces or domestic estrangements are more common in Western freer societies than in rigid Eastern countries.

socially or recognize their worth, and they develop hostility toward society and indulge in anti-social activities or try to undermine the established social institutions. Frustration leads to aggression. The aggressive and hostile tendencies of many people may show themselves in such activities as fault-finding, opposition to every move or indifference to social activities. Children who are brought up under strict discipline will treat others strictly, break out in serious misbehaviour or withdraw from all situations. But sometimes hostility toward frustrating conditions can bring about very wholesome results. When social and economic conditions are so bad as to block justice, freedom, growth and happiness of the masses, an intelligent hostility leading to aggressive compaign against governmental control to remedy such frustrating conditions is very commendable. As has already been pointed out some of the great names in history like Shivaji, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Lajpat Rai, Gandhi, and Nehru fôught against economic and political disabilities and frustrations and brought about improvement in the life of the masses.

Thus the consequences of frustration are not always bad. Frustration is associated with tension, unhappiness and misery, but its effects depend on what may be termed a frustration-tolerance of the individual. Some people are just 'floored' by their frustrations and give way to depression, inaction and helplessness. Others intensify their effort to overcome them, reorganize their understanding and thinking of the problem and modify both their goals and plans of action.

Aggression and hostility are, generally, not tolerated or permitted in organized society except of course in sports and athletic activities. That is why most of the above-mentioned great men were persecuted by the foreign government. Society too does not approve of aggressively hostile behaviour and condemns it as boorish, unrefined, and even uncivilized. Often hostility and aggression when resented and disapproved lead to greater and stronger hostility and aggression.

Many of the social troubles arise from expressions of aggression by one person against another or one group against another, as in wars, communal riots, or racial conflicts. It has been argued that hostility and aggression of this sort is usually 'displaced', that is, directed against objects and persons not

necessarily related logically to the frustrating situation. Thus children who are frustrated at home by over-strict discipline of the parents relieve their hostility by acting aggressively outside the home or in the school. A person rejected for employment by Government agencies may condemn Government policies, quarrel with his friends or even beat his wife and children. Thus the objects of hostility and aggression are unconnected with the original thwarting and source of frustration. In large towns social disparities and conflicts, the vast gulf between the high and the low, economic insecurities and difficulties of life, and other conditions which prevent the satisfaction of basic needs cause frustration-aggression of deep and intense types. People cannot give direct expression to it nor are they fully aware of the causes of such problems and difficulties. Law, custom, socially accepted decencies of life and the like do not let them give vent to their hostility and aggression within their group. So they in a way generalize their aggression or displace it to members of outgroups and any move to express resentment or protest against other races, groups or countries finds their ready support. That is why it is always easy to organize protest meetings, processions and strikes in urban and industrial areas. A study carried out in America in 1930 demonstrated that the number of lynchings were in inverse proportion to the prices of cotton. When cotton prices rose the number of lynchings fell, and when the prices fell the number of lynchings went up Economic frustrations caused displaced hostility and aggression against an outgroup.

Expressions of hostility and aggression vary from person to person and group to group In modern urbanized industrial societies with increased opportunities for display and aggrandizement, life is fast and everybody is running to do much in less time, and therefore frustrations are deep and widespread. A slight provocation sparks off a riot or a protest procession In socially stable and rigid groups where the place, vocation and status of each member is clearly marked and where standards of conduct are well defined, every person knows what is expected of him or her and frustrations are comparatively fewer. One indication of this fact is that suicides, divorces or domestic estrangements are more common in Western freer societies than in rigid Eastern countries.

Secondly, a frustrated person is usually afflicted with *anxiety*. He experiences discomfort and misery of the extreme type, so much so that it upsets his health and causes many bodily ailments like headaches, chronic ulcers of the intestine, blood pressure and others. Such ailments are described as *psychosomatic* because they are caused by mental tension and emotional disturbance. The list of such ailments is long for psychological difficulties may upset any type of organic functioning.

And thirdly, a frustrated anxious person loses efficiency and resourcefulness in overcoming his frustration and this again increases his anxiety. He does not try new ways of solving his conflicts, becomes rigid in his approach, and perpetuates his state of frustration and anxiety.

Frustration reactions

Frustration and anxiety are common and there are various levels of responding to them. The healthiest course is to put in greater effort to remove the frustrating obstacle and to solve the problem. This is not difficult because the mounting tension within makes such any effort easy as it helps to mobilize all energies of the individual. He may try to perceive the problem in a new way, reorganize his thought and understanding of the problem, and developing new insight tackle it with new resources and strength. All this is positive and constructive.

But often the individual is weighed down by feelings of apprehension and anxiety caused by frustration. Anxiety is a painful emotion which produces irritability, depression, and fatigue. To get rid of it some people withdraw from the frustrating situation instead of fighting it out with renewed effort and insight. This is a substitute reaction to which they have recourse when frustration is too strong to be resolved. These substitute reactions furnish a means of release from the tensions and anxieties of frustration. They avoid goal-directed behaviour, but seek to cope with anxiety in an indirect way. They are also called *behaviour mechanisms* or *defense mechanisms;* they do not help to get rid of the situation that is causing anxiety but only to cope with or reduce anxiety that is caused. They make us feel that we do not need to make any changes in ourselves or in our environment and that we can protect our self-steem by taking shelter in them. Since these modes of reaction help us in the defence of our

self-concept they are termed *defense* mechanisms.

These defense mechanisms involve distortions in perception and reasoning. By denying or misinterpreting some aspects of reality the individual adopts modes of behaviour or belief with which he often unconsciously seeks to defend his self from blame or feeling of guilt. Some of the important defense mechanisms are being discussed here, as they throw a flood of light on the dynamics of behaviour and motivation.

Repression

This mechanism consists of excluding from conscious experience various perceptions, motives, memories, etc. which would be unpleasant and anxiety-provoking if consciously expressed. When we have conflicts we cannot handle, unpleasant memories we cannot face, and injuries we will not acknowledge, repression occurs. When they become too much for us, our unconscious may keep them from getting an entry into our consciousness.

Repression is a basic mechanism. According to Freud when primitive and animal tendencies of man come into conflict with his conscience or moral ideas, they are pushed back into the unconscious. Obviously the phenomenon of repression is social. Social regulation of behaviour through customs, traditions, laws and taboos implies a large amount of inhibitions and repressions and so social disapproval is avoided. Some repression leads to behaviour socially approved, but when conflicts are violent repression may lead to one form or the other of neurotic behaviour.

Feelings and memories which are inconsistent with our self-picture at the moment are likely to be repressed. To recognize and accept them as a part of our experience would be to admit ambiguity in our nature and thus produce anxiety. For example, when highly emotionalized desires are defeated, they may lie low and fester till they break out in disordered behaviour. A repression is a buried trouble. The effect of painful experience does not die when repressed but seems to smoulder in the unconscious and clog up the mental and emotional processes. Repressions do their mischief by distorting our behaviour, by distorting our feelings, and in general by making us unhappy.

Rationalization

This mechanism as the term implies seeks to make irrational look rational by providing good reasons for true reasons. The individual makes use of untrue but seemingly plausible reasons or explanations, more or less unconsciously, to sustain his ego or to make himself appear in good light. He finds justifications and excuses for his conduct. Ministers are made to quit for irregularities, but they claim that they are quitting office to be of greater service to the nation in organizing constructive activities. Students who score low marks in examinations or fail plead that examinations are not a true test of one's abilities, and in any case they do not wish to be bookworms. During the last World War too many countries on both sides claimed that they were fighting for freedom and democracy while they were fighting for national self-interest. War aims were 'to make the world safe for decency', 'to end war for all times to come', and the like. Many poor parents never tire of telling their children about the virtues of poverty.

When the goal is beyond our reach it looks less attractive as grapes were sour to the fox, and when a less attractive goal is easily reached it is much more attractive like the sweet lemon. Rationalizing is not just excuse-making, for we are not aware that we are making up socially acceptable reasons for our behaviour. The process is an unconscious one. The purpose is to look good to others and protect our self-esteem.

The need of rationalization arises largely in society in which people lay so much store by reason and logic and therefore socially acceptable reasons are given. In fact our social and cultural pattern is such that rationalization is not only necessary but is also expected. Nobody is expected to admit that he puts on fine clothes to show off, spends thousands on lighting at his daughter's marriage to make neighbours envy, or hit his neighbour's dog with a stick intentionally to express his hatred for the master. On the other hand, he is very much appreciated and applauded if he says that he put on these clothes as he had nothing better to wear, made elaborate lighting arrangements to help guests to park their cars, and hit the dog accidentally while flourishing his stick. Rationalizations are useful both to the individual and the society. The distortions take the edge off the unpleasant truth, make embarrassing situations palatable and

save the self-esteem of the individual concerned.

'The White man's burden', Britain's mission to spread the benefits of civilization to backward people, China's concern to rid the world of colonialism and imperialism, and similar other political slogans and labels are rationalizations, illustrating the close relationship between desire and belief. What the White man, the British race and the Chinese stood to gain was never mentioned. America is using such rationalizations against Negroes as some White people are using them in favour of South African brethren.

In India communal hatred and caste prejudices have frequently been rationalized by supporters of communalism and casteism. Too many leaders in every culture, community, caste or economic system are claiming perfection and offering complicated arguments in support of their contentions. What is worse they believe it to be so. Such rationalizations are great obstacles to programmes, and policies of social change and political and economic reconstruction.

Displacement

Illustrations of this mechanism have already been given: how a father snubbed in the office gives vent to his anger on reaching home, or how people in large towns harrowed by social insecurities, frustrations and deprivations join strikes and protest processions. Displacement is the expression of emotion in a situation other than the one which aroused it. It is substituting another goal in place of the original goal or motive and is commonly associated with the shifting of aggressive hostile attitude to an object, person or situation other than the one which was responsible for arousing it in the first instance. A child rebuked by the teacher pinches his classmate The emotional reactions commonly involved in displacement are anger, hate and fear, partly because they are strong emotions and partly because their free expression in social situations is not approved There is an Indian proverb that a person who falls from the horse curses the horseman. Many primitive people beat their breasts when they are helpless in expressing their hostility against their enemies. Self-torture and suicides are often cases of displaced aggression.

Displaced hostility and aggression are a common feature in an authoritarian society or administration. A person who is rebuk-

ed, snubbed or punished by his boss and cannot retaliate finds some other target for expressing his frustration. Usually in every department or group there is a low-status individual who becomes the easy target, that is, the one who is made a scapegoat. Scapegoating is very common. Our own government blames the growth of population for scarcity of foodgrains and consumer goods, holds student indiscipline responsible for the falling educational standards or blames the press for communal disturbances. This scapegoating helps the individual to disclaim all responsibility for the problem or the difficulty and laying it at the door of somebody else.

In international politics small nations usually blame big powers for all the trouble in domestic matters and make scapegoats of their neighbours for border troubles. Many nations make alliances simply because they have a common enemy whom they hate, and their love for each other is displaced hatred for the enemy.

Projection

This defense mechanism consists in attributing to others one's own unconscious motives, desires, qualities, defects or attitudes, and thus using others as a screen on which are thrown out one's own mental states and processes.

A dishonest person criticizes others for dishonesty, and in doing so he raises his own self-esteem by emphasizing that others are much more dishonest than he. He sees dishonesty in all those with whom he comes in contact, he decries the growing dishonesty and corruption in the world and by doing so he indirectly admits his own guilt while boosting his self-esteem. The situations are there for all to interpret and they are interpreted in the light of our needs, wishes, anxieties and emotional states. Modern China sees expansionism, colonialism and imperialism in Indian policies and programmes because she herself is projecting her own policies on others.

When we admire a beautiful house, scene, or work of art, and when we consider a house to be gloomy, a scene to be depressing, or a work of art to be morbid, we are projecting our own moods and attitudes. Literary critics are victims of projection when in their comments and criticism they reveal their own foibles and shortcomings. In pushing their weaknesses away from

themselves they gain a feeling of superiority over those to whom they attribute their own faults. Many people who failed to take advantage of their opportunities for better and higher education blame their family responsibilities toward their brothers and sisters. Some of the explanations are correct but many use them to justify themselves and maintain their respect and standing The facts are that many students support themselves during the college course by part-time employment, borrowing or scholarships. People who indulge in loose talk and backbiting are for ever criticizing others for the same. Those who are themselves stingy and miserly, mean and unscrupulous, or extravagant and thoughtless are inclined to attribute these traits to others. This attack on others is a defense mechanism.

Projection is, in a way, a form of rationalization, because it excuses failure and places faults on others. A bad workman quarrels with his tools, he projects his troubles on outside conditions in order to defend himself.

All perception involves projection and this fact is the basis of Rorschach's Ink Blot Test and T.A.T. (Thematic Apperception Test).

Identification

This defense mechanism involves the unconscious placing of oneself in the situation of another person and assuming the characteristics of that person. It is the practice of feeling that you are in the role of someone else. Watching a film, you may identify yourself with one of the actors in it and feel yourself in his position, thus obtaining the emotional experience of being that actor. Young people frequenting film shows identify themselves with actors to get rid of their troubles. In the cinema hall he may be a millionaire, a lover or a great poet, but in real life he may be struggling to keep body and soul together or may be very much disheartened by his troubles. Such identification occurs in watching TV, listening to radio, or reading stories, novels or biographies. Identifications are more common in adolescence and youth, but at all ages superiors in all walks of life have been imitated by those who work under them. Many habits of parents are adopted by children and some ways of the boss are taken over by his juniors.

Identification is common is several areas of social living Hero-

worship, declaring social and political leaders as our guiding stars, testimonial advertising, and the like, help to boost our own prestige and conceal our faults.

Compensation

This mechanism makes up for frustration, for some defect or weakness. Compensation is more or less unconsciously motivated behaviour whose purpose is to make up for what we feel we lack. It is substitute reaction of frustration in which an individual 'makes up' for a defect, deficiency or weakness by adopting a different but successful mode of response. Compensation is commendable when we compensate for our inadequacies and failure with virtues and strength, but it is undesirable when we try to cover up our inadequacies and failures with unacceptable behaviour. A person who loses his sight tries to develop his auditory and tactual sense powers. A student who does not do well in studies may develop success in athletics. A girl who is not bestowed with very good looks may develop a very sociable temper and an attitude of understanding and sympathy toward all those whom she meets, and may thus become a very attractive personality. These are, no doubt, very desirable compensations.

But some compensations are undesirable. Many boys become bullies and 'problems' in school only to compensate for their inferiority in studies or family status. They make up the want of recognition by swaggering and showing off. Some people appear very stiff, are hard to talk to, do not invite conversation and put up a pose for dignity. They may be just covering up their inferiority and seeking compensation. They may be socially inadequate and are making up for it.

Compensation is a very common defense mechanism and in our competitive culture is resorted to by almost everybody to cover up his failures and inferiority. It is a general concept which includes identification, and may be found in a large variety of responses. Although the term is used most frequently in connection with the concept of inferiority complex and the feeling of insecurity, its application is on a much wider scale to include gaps in environment, defects in the biological heritage or flaws of personality. Substitution, daydreaming, or bluffing are some of the common forms of compensation.

Sublimation

Originally sublimation meant the process by which a person unable to express his sex drive (the *id*) directly, directed or diverted the sex energy into some form of substitute behaviour like art, literature. The followers of Sigmund Freud who was originally responsible for the term would have us believe that if it were not for this sublimation process our culture would not have developed into the complex pattern that it is today. But today the term is used in a very broad sense, to include all types of compensation particularly the desirable type of substitute behaviour which is unconsciously motivated. The commonest example cited in all textbooks is of the young woman who, failing to satisfy her needs of a family and children of her own sublimates her desires by taking to teaching in a school or looking after patients as a nurse. The substitute activities are of a higher order than the blocked activity. The artistic, literary, teaching or hospital work is superior to just bearing children and bringing them up. Some extremists would have us believe that all art is a general outlet for the sex drive, but has a communicative aspect which has not much to do with sex.

Many psychologists avoid the use of the term because it implies resolving conflict or frustration by the redirection of impulses into 'constructive' channels, and introduces concepts of value or worth with which scientific thinking wishes to have nothing to do. Many describe it as 'a flight into creative work'

Regression

On the other hand regression is a 'flight into childhood' because in this defense mechanism the individual retreats to an earlier and lower level of development and substitutes infantile mode of adjustment to frustration. Under the stress of a conflict or anxiety people regress, that is, return to forms of behaviour that were satisfying or effective in the past but that are no longer appropriate to our present level of development. When the burden of responsibilities is too heavy many adults break into tears or in moments of extreme anxiety, they start biting their nails. Many women dash their heads against the wall when they are intensely frustrated. On many occasions surcharged with emotion, people jump with joy like children, or shout in anger or begin to sob.

Regression is most common among children but in certain abnormal cases adults return to the level of an infant. Regression is a return to the past, but the solutions that were satisfying at an earlier age are no longer effective. Experiments with children have shown that when they are thwarted in play they return to those forms of play which they enjoyed at a younger age.

In a way all maladjustments are regressive because the person withdraws from the situation and adopts too simple a solution of his difficulties.

Fantasy

Fantasy is another mechanism of escape from frustration into a make-believe world of fancy and daydreams. It is also a withdrawal from reality, a substitute behaviour in which the person faced with tedious and irksome tasks lets his mind drift into fancies that it would be nicer if instead of working he were in a forest, gathering flowers, listening to birds or reading a novel under the shade of a tree. Such daydreaming is a sort of wish-fulfilment. Some people indulge in large-scale planning of their lives. Sometimes such plans help us to realize the goal but more often they serve as a kind of substitute for it. Dreams both at night and during the day reflect and project our feelings, needs and wishes.

Reaction formation

This mechanism means denial of unacceptable and unworthy motives by developing their opposites in extreme form. The tension of extreme hostility is relieved by an outward expression of extreme suavity and affection. It is an unconscious adoption of a pattern of behaviour directly opposite to what motives and traits one wishes to deny or disclaim. In sublimation the substitute goal is accepted as the original motive and is in the same direction, but in reaction the substitute goal is the direct opposite of the original one. The love-sick youth would deny any interest in girls and would act as to show that he hates them as a class. This mechanism is also called *over-compensation*. An old maid who suffers from the conflict which is aroused by a wish for a suitor may protect herself by developing a fear that someone is under her bed. Many anti-corruptionists are themselves corrupt and their activities are a facade behind which

they hide their corrupt desires Reaction formation is of great value in psychoanalytic psychology for giving us a basis for understanding character disorders.

Conclusion

This long list of defense mechanisms describes different types of frustration reactions. They are not mutually exclusive, nor do they represent a complete classification. They are just modes of adjustment evolved by man to meet frustrations or situations which block motivated behaviour. There are many more ways of dealing with frustration which have been described by psychoanalysts. When placed in a disturbing situation many people retreat and withdraw into solitude. Some indulge in back-chat and violently criticize others because they are intensely anxious about their own shortcomings. Others act in a manner that will attract the attention and win the sympathy of others. Other adopt an injured innocence attitude or indulge in self-pity. Still others indulge in negativism, doing just the opposite of what they are told or not doing what is suggested.

But the role of these defense mechanisms in social behaviour should not be exaggerated. In countries where large populations are frustrated as in China, Nazi Germany or South Africa such mechanisms may be powerful determinants of social behaviour, but in an orthodox Hindu community prescribing rigid modes of conduct, their role may be less significant. But most of the social situations will lie between these two extremes depending largely on the type of personalities which participate in social drama and the type of cultural setting in which that drama is played.

It should also be noted that most of these mechanisms are learned in social situations and lead to behaviour which is largely social. Some cultures encourage their adoption as modern civilized life commends rationalization and encourages repression of sex impulses.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

KLEIN, D. B. *Mental Hygiene* (New York: Henry Holt & Co)
SHAFFER, L. F. *The Psychology of Adjustment* (Boston. Houghton Mifflin).
YOUNG, K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd).
COLEMAN, J. C. *Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life* (Scott, Foresman).
LINDGREN, H. C. *Psychology of Personal and Social Adjustments* (New York: American Book Co).

CHAPTER V

PERCEPTION, MEMORY AND LEARNING

In the last two chapters we have been dealing with human motives and adjustment patterns as they are basic to human behaviour. Needs, goals, and tensions cause and initiate behaviour, but the content and direction of behaviour is shaped by knowledge and experience. In fact human beings adjust themselves to their environment and become members of society because they are able to take cognizance of the vast and varied array of physical and social stimuli surrounding them. The processes of perception and learning help the individual to organize his behaviour. No doubt the sense-organs are the same in all human beings and they give the same types of sensations, but the meanings and interpretations they acquire differ with different individuals. The social-cultural training of the individual affects and determines his perceptions, memories, learning and thinking as it does his drives and motives. Let us deal with these mental processes in detail.

Perception

Perception is usually described as a response to stimuli and general psychology refers to the sensory activity of the organism as determining our perception and knowledge of the external world. The major sensory processes are those of hearing, seeing, smelling, tasting, touching and the like, but they become perceptions only when meaning, interpretation, or judgement is added to them. We may see a black spot on the branch of a tree but it becomes perception only when we interpret it as a crow, a kite or a black rag. This meaning is the 'deposit' of past experience in which are mixed images, values and the beginnings of judgement, and is developed when we classify, name, analyse and judge what we see, hear, touch or smell. Recently studies in social psychology have shown that perception is no longer an

individual phenomenon, the nature of which is determined by the sensory apparatus receiving impulses from without, but involves reference to his motives, attitudes, past experience, expectations and the like, all of which have social implications. Perception is not free from social factors, it involves reading a meaning into the object of perception and this is partly determined by the way we have been trained to look at that kind of object or situation. An orthodox Hindu's perception of a cow is different from that of a Chicago beef-eater. Women perceive a social gathering differently from men. On the road we perceive some people and do not perceive others; we talk to some people but just nod at others. Barbers may see only the hair-cut of the passers-by, while shoe-shiners perceive only their shoes, and tailors their clothes.

Krech and Crutchfield distinguish between two types of determinants of perception, *structural* and *functional*. The *structural* factors are related to the nature of the physical stimuli and the neural effects they arouse in the nervous system of the individual. The *functional* factors of perceptual organization are derived from the needs, motives, moods, past experience and memory of the individual. Most of the recent studies of perception try to assess the relative contribution of these two groups of factors in sense perception, and show that even the simplest perceptions of the infant take on structure and meaning. Whatever is perceived is organized into an object pattern. The small parts are not seen as distinct objects but are interrelated and organized to form a whole. In any act of perception there is a good deal of filling in the gaps and the missing parts are supplied to complete a pattern. This is true even with the perception of a personality. A few traits are presented and on their basis a whole picture is formed by supplying related traits. Thus [illegible] we respond by forming a unified impression and presenting a completed account of the person.

Human beings organize their perceptions, knowledge and experiences not only of things and persons but also of events, situations and ideas. While the scientist can refrain from judgment till all the evidence is in, ordinary people prejudge events, misinterpret them and perceive a meaningful whole on the basis of one or two facts.

Again perception is very selective. We do not perceive all

things that come into our view. It is not a mechanical process of registering all that is presented to our sense organs. Perception is influenced by needs, motives, interests and past experiences. There are a large number of stimuli impinging upon us from *within* our body and the outside environment, and a good many of them have to be ignored. Selection is determined by what the organism wants to see or what it wants to avoid seeing. The possibilities of reward, need fulfilment, attitudes, values, anxieties and the like are some of the very large number of conditions which affect and determine perception. A number of experimental studies show that the objects or stimuli of perception are selected or emphasized in view of the purpose of the perceiving individual. Ambiguous figures presented to hungry people are perceived as articles of food. Of two persons sitting in a lunch room, if one is hungry and the other is thirsty, on seeing the menu card the former will perceive articles of food only and the latter will perceive drink items. Thus certain objects are selected in perception because of the individual's needs and motives.

The *mood* of the moment also affects this selection. In a critical mood the perceiver finds fault with everything and perceives only mistakes and shortcomings and in a happier mood details are not noticed and everything seems to be all right in a general way.

Habits too bear on this selection. An artist will perceive things which a merchant will ignore, because both of them have learned what to expect and what to perceive.

Selectivity of perception is especially marked in social interaction in which the person's self-esteem is at stake. Psychiatrists and clinical psychologists have long noted that the tendency among men and women is to ignore or misperceive things which would be damaging to their egos if they were correctly perceived.

The mental set of the individual also determines selective perception. We see people wearing clothes and hardly attend to the cut of their suits, the shape and size of their pockets, the number of buttons in the jacket and the like, but if we are on our way to the tailor to get a new suit made we select these items for perception and see them in great detail and clearly.

Again cultural background of the perceiver also makes a dif-

ference to what is perceived. An average Hindu will not see in a boxing match what his American brother does He will perceive the brutality and pain of the sport while the American will see how skilfully the two are punching each other. What is selected for perception is determined not only by the physiological structure of the sense organs but also by the social and cultural background of the person who is perceiving. Perceptual discriminations vary from group to group. A fisherman perceives boats on the horizon long before a sea-bather does, a hunter sees game more readily than others Ladies see patterns and colour-shades of the dress of other ladies in a party far more readily and accurately than men do Differences in food tastes also show social determination of perceptions Social influences affect perception in a very marked way, for the very simple reason that all perception involves interpretation which in its turn depends on needs, motives, interests, purposes, social and cultural influences and backgrounds

Indian and American students read about Russia's foreign policy and both hold fairly clear and firm views about it. Now if a Russian statesman makes a conciliatory statement towards the Western powers, the Indian student sees in it hope for better international relations, but the American calls it a lie and reads some clever trick in it. The background of attitudes and beliefs influences the selective character of perception The truth has been stressed by several psychologists in different ways. One observes 'We see things, not as they are, but as we are', another says, 'People see what they are looking for'.

A word of caution is necessary here No one can live in the world if he sees only what suits him Perception is not arbitrary, it is determined by the environment and is limited by what is actually presented to our sense organs. Perception causes behaviour to become more discriminating, more flexible, with respect to one's environment, but it cannot be independent of the environment and its reality

The term *social perception* has only recently come into use Older explanation of perception stressed that sensations are received through sense organs and then are combined according to the laws of association, but association depends on the assimilation of the impression into the individual's apperceptive mass Memories, habits of thought and expression, moral ideas, beliefs

and the like constitute the apperceptive mass and the new impression enters into a creative relation with it. Social perception studied in social psychology is identical with the principles of perception found in the field of general psychology, and the difference if any lies in the emphasis on the social aspect of perception or perception of the social environment. The illustrations given above are all of social perception. In a crowd people push us and tread on our toes. This perception is different from what we have when somebody in anger pushes us and treads on our toes. This emphasis on the social aspect of perception is peculiar to our study of the perceptual process in social psychology.

Generally the term social perception is used for a large body of studies carried out in detail to find some regular and predictable relation between man's general adjustment to his environment and the large number of social factors, which in one way or another, determine or help such adjustment. This relation may be of several kinds. Social influences may affect our perception of the physical environment as has been shown above, or changes in the physical environment may affect the way in which we react to the various aspects of our social environment. This relation between the physical and the social aspects of our environment is of great importance in our studies of social perception.

It would take us too far afield to detail out some of the important experimental studies made in social perception, but the major areas of investigation are three: (1) the effects of social factors on perception of the physical environment, (2) the effects of labels (stereotypes) on perception of people, and (3) the nature of inference in perception of people. It is obvious that a good deal of social perception is not purely perception as such but elements of thinking and reasoning enter into it. That is why several social psychologists prefer to use the word 'cognition' instead of perception. When we perceive a person to be miserly because he is a Jew we are not really perceiving but inferring and judging.

Memory

Social and cultural influences are also important in determining what we remember and some of the factors emphasized as ope-

rating in the case of perception, also apply to memory. Students of psychology generally proceed on the assumption that a large number of facts known about remembering are due to the nature of the nervous system and are valid for human beings everywhere. Social factors clearly enter, however, in determining what we remember. A very clear illustration is provided by the story of a number of Swazi chiefs from South Africa who visited England On returning the most vivid memory they had was that of a British policeman regulating traffic with an uplifted hand. This may be explained by the fact that the Swazi greets his friend in a somewhat similar manner, and he was therefore impressed by the use of this gesture in a foreign country with such marked effect. It fitted into his social framework and so was remembered Bartlett cites many examples of people differing in the manner and content of remembering because of cultural variations Tribes enthusiastic about fighting and armed conflicts live through memories of their exploits with great vividness and enthusiasm, but tribes not given to fighting have only a vague memory of such experiences and recall them in an unmoved manner Villagers recall details of marriages, cattle shows, journeys and children with great pleasure and interest, and townspeople may be more enthusiastic about their urban social functions

Klineberg quotes a very interesting experiment of Zillig She presented to a number of subjects, male and female, a list of statements about the nature of women Some of them were favourable praising the character and role of women, others selected from the works of Schopenhauer and Oscar Wilde were distinctly unfavourable. A week after presentation, the subjects were called upon to recall those statements It was found that women showed a tendency to remember mostly those statements that were favourable to them and men mostly remembered those that were unfavourable So memory is not entirely a function of the nervous system.

Learning

Learning is almost synonymous with living and stands for processes that bring about more or less permanent changes in behaviour as a result of experience and practice. Most of us are inclined to think of learning in terms of formal learning

situations such as school learning, music lessons, or tailoring classes. But it is obvious that we did not know from birth how to use language, to lace our shoe, to button our coats, to eat with knife and fork or to allow ladies to enter first. The way we behave today is mostly what we have learned in the course of our life and experience. The test of learning is that a mode of behaviour, having taken place once, is more likely to occur again.

Some learning is universal, for example, we all learn that the sun rises daily in the east. But some learning like beliefs and rituals is confined to our community, and some learning is unique for each individual such as his personal skills, thoughts and feelings. What marks you off from your brother, colleagues or family is what you have learned in the course of your day-to-day life.

Learning is essential for adaptation to environment and consequent survival. As the civilization of man has developed, the child of each new generation has had to learn all the skills and habits of the previous generation and more. Social and group living obliged him to acquire group co-operation, language, tools, social graces, and all that makes group living practicable and happy. To become an acceptable member of a group each individual has to learn a lot.

Learning is the central problem of psychology. If our behaviour, attitudes, habits, ideas, beliefs, skills, sentiments and all that we are today and hope to become tomorrow is to be learned; if we could know how we learn them and alter them; if psychology could provide us with satisfactory laws of learning, we could control and predict the behaviour of people, change their blind prejudices against people of other groups and cultures and reduce or altogether eliminate the hatred which makes one nation try to destroy another. If this science of psychology could give us an accurate and reliable understanding of the learning process we could produce better men and women, banish group and interpersonal antipathies, and make this world safe for happiness and peace.

For the last few decades psychologists have carried out thousands of experiments in learning and interpreted their results in a number of ways. Although no theory is complete, taken together they shed considerable light on the subjects of learning. We shall consider them briefly here.

Connectionism or stimulus-response theory

All students of psychology are familiar with the approach that every activity or behaviour is a response to a stimulus. The symbol *S* stands for the situation or the stimulus which leads to or is connected with response denoted by the symbol *R*. Stimuli are the sources of energy in the environment which evoke responses. A stimulus is connected with its response by *S-R* bond so that in future when the stimulus is repeated the response *R* follows. Thus bonds or connections are formed between situations and responses. This connectionism or bond theory was put forward by Thorndike and Woodworth. These bonds may be motor, perceptual, emotional or conceptual and can be organized into systems Skills, knowledge, sentiments are such systems Learning is the process by which these bonds are formed, strengthened and organized into systems

On the basis of his detailed investigations into the learning activities of animals, Thorndike formulated the three laws of learning which state the conditions facilitating learning The laws of frequency, recency and effect refer to practice and repetition, recency of experience, and rewards and satisfactions which strengthen the bonds of learning Of these the law of effect is considered basic. Satisfactory results strengthen learning and annoying results weaken it.

Learning as conditioning

Another behaviourist approach considers learning as conditioning and Pavlov was its first exponent His experiments with a hungry dog are well known The hungry dog salivates when food is presented to him, and a bell is rung with the presentation of food This situation is repeated a number of times Finally the bell is rung and no food is presented, and he salivates He has become conditioned to respond by salivating to the stimulus of the ringing bell It is a case of substituting one stimulus for the other or of associating a weaker stimulus with a stronger stimulus so that the organism is enabled to transfer the response connected with the stronger stimulus to the weaker stimulus when the stronger stimulus is removed Learning by conditioned response is learning by associating the response with a substitute stimulus

A special terminology has grown out of experiments on

conditioning. Food is the 'unconditioned' stimulus and salivation is the 'unconditioned response'. The sound of the bell is the 'conditioned stimulus' and now salivation is the 'conditioned response'. *Extinction* is the tendency of the response to weaken or disappear when the original stimulus is removed. If no food is presented for a long time and only the bell is rung salivation may grow less or disappear. *Reinforcement* is strengthening learning by rewards. If food is presented now and then even after the dog has learned to salivate on the ringing of the bell, the conditioned response is reinforced or strengthened. Children learn table manners better if their behaviour is approved by smiles or given recognition. *Generalization* is the transfer or extension of the response to other stimuli. A baby frightened by a cat may extend his fear to all furry animals. Meeting a few railway officials who are corrupt one may assume that all railway officials are like that. *Spontaneous recovery* is the return of the conditioned response after a period of extinction. Many people in old age have recourse to weeping to get their things done as they did in childhood, or start remembering their long lost sons or wives in moments of need. *Discrimination* refers to the ability to differentiate between situations as a result of experience or training. Later on the individual may see that some railway officials are not corrupt. Thus, the faults of generalization are corrected by seeing differences in the stimulating situations. But if discrimination is very baffling because differences are too small or vague, the person may develop maladjustments and inability to decide which course of action to adopt. This is *experimental neurosis*. It is possible the dog may salivate when a light is given and if that light has been presented a number of times along with the ringing of the bell. This is called *second-order conditioning*. Third-order conditioning is not possible at least with the dogs. In *higher-order conditioning* another stimulus is substituted for the already conditioned stimulus, and according to the behaviourists most of the use of symbols by human beings is based on this capacity for multiple conditioning.

The theory of conditioning does not explain all types of learning, but stresses the role of drill and practice in learning and training, and the need and value of eliminating, distracting, opposing, and annoying influences during learning, which would otherwise affect it adversely.

Hull's theory of reinforcement

The learning theory of Clark Hull of Yale University is a stimulus-response theory but he combines the law of effect with the concept of conditioning under the concept of *reinforcement* which has already been briefly touched upon.

The term reinforcement means strengthening the tendency of a response to be repeated. When an organism responds to a *stimulus and that response is reinforced, it is very probable that* the same response will be repeated the next time that stimulus occurs Human beings and animals are constantly striving to build new stimulus-response connections and strengthen existing stimulus-response connections. The first comes by conditioning and the second by learning by 'effect'. A conditioned response is possible only if the child or animal has a need or primary drive and the law of effect operates when that need or drive is satisfied or reduced. Many psychologists agree that the reduction in the strength of primary drive or need is a reinforcing factor. The *law of primary enforcement* may be stated thus: A stimulus *S* is presented, it is followed by a response *R*, and *if this S-R bond is closely associated in time with the reduction* of a drive or a tension state resulting from a need, there will be an increased tendency for that *S-R* bond to be repeated. Activities which reduce thirst or relieve pain are generally reinforcing

Several experiments have been made with the time interval between the conditioned stimulus and the response, and they indicate that with the increase in time interval the response follows less frequently If the interval is more than 30 seconds conditioning is negligible This reduction in the frequency or strength of conditioning is called the *gradient of reinforcement.* The dog would not salivate on the ringing of the bell if there is an interval of more than 30 seconds between the presentation of food and the ringing of the bell.

Hull puts forward the theory of *secondary reinforcement* to account for learning situations where there is a longer interval of time between the reinforced response and need reduction. All our needs are not primary. The need for food is primary but the need for money which can buy food is secondary Secondary needs are acquired, and though they do not by themselves reduce any need they are associated with things which help to reduce need.

Money is a secondary reinforcement, its need reduction power is remote but it is closely and consistently connected with need reduction. This is *secondary reinforcement*. Briefly and simply the theory of secondary reinforcement means that the connection between food presentation and salivation which has been reinforced by the reduction of the primary drive of hunger acquires the power to reinforce any other connection, contiguous or immediately antecedent, as that between money and food, and this may in turn reinforce any other connection as that between education and money. Education and money in this case are secondary reinforcing agents.

Gestalt psychology of learning

The theories of learning that we have considered above take a piecemeal analytical view of learning. Gestalt psychology is interested in larger aspects of human behaviour and studies it in wholes rather than in parts. The learner is not a mere automaton making responses mechanically or staging needs and drives passively. He is creative and constructive, and can relate his learning to larger areas and impart new meanings to his experiences. The living organism is constantly organizing and reorganizing itself as it interacts with the environment, and learning is one of its important activities. The word 'insight' is used to describe behaviour and learning and the words 'structuring' or 'reconstructuring' are used for organizing. In deciding the shortest route to the school the child does not have to try out each of a dozen alternatives. He decides it by insight. Insight is possible when all possible solutions are within the grasp of the individual.

Learning by insight is characterized by the sudden grasping of the solution, the learned response makes its appearance suddenly. It is the flash of understanding which comes to us all of a sudden. There is no gradual process of trial-and-error. There is confusion and all at once comes a point where everything makes sense. A process of organizing and reorganizing or of 'structuring' and 'reconstructuring' leads to discovery. It is obvious that learning by insight is much more efficient than learning by trial-and-error, and man's discoveries and inventions, his new and creative ideas, and his new solutions to problems owe their origin and development to insight.

Tolman's theory of sign-learning

. E. C. Tolman rejects stimulus-response bonds and trial-and-error in learning. Learning is not mechanical, it is purposive. Striving towards a goal is the heart of the learning process. If a hungry rat is placed in a maze it wanders about in right and wrong paths until it finally reaches the food spot. If these trials are repeated the number of errors grows less and the rat takes less and less time to reach the goal. According to the theories of connectionism and reinforcement the bond between the stimulus and the response has been strengthened, wrong responses have been eliminated and correct responses learned, according to the principles of contiguity, frequency, recency and effect. Tolman's explanation is that it is not a series of movements that is learned but signs. The learner perceives the nature of the situation, works on it reviewing and elaborating it, and builds a 'cognitive structure', a sort of cognitive map of the environment. This structure or the map provides guides or signs or stimuli with a meaning which decides what route the rat will take in the maze. Tolman agrees with Hull in stressing needs and their satisfaction but while Hull thinks that a response is being learned through reinforcement or need reduction, Tolman says that the *response is learned in terms of the 'signs', or cognitive guides*

Perception and observation is an important factor in Tolman's theory of learning, but the learner discriminates and organizes the guiding signs in his problem situation He is following those signs to a goal, and is learning meanings and not movements. He accepts the role of motives in learning but he insists that they improve performance only. Learning is not determined solely by an expectation of rewards There is also 'self-organized activity' of the learner which helps him to explore for himself. Rather strong motivation may interfere with progress in learning. All higher forms of learning are due to self-activity

Motivation in learning

The role of motivation in learning has always been recognized. We may express it in the 'law of effect', need satisfaction or reinforcement or identify it as a pleasure-pain principle. These are very useful concepts. Learning depends on the needs, goals and tensions of the individual. But in the first place learning is most efficient when motivation is neither too low nor too strong

Extreme type of motivation leads to anxiety and stress in the learning situation. Some experimental studies have shown that anxiety tends to interfere with verbal learning while anxiety has enhanced the conditioning of certain reflexes. Secondly, at the human level the role of motivation leaves a number of questions about learning unanswered. How does a child acquire the use of language, written or spoken? He may be induced to put in greater effort at learning speech by the promise of greater and greater rewards. Or it may be his great desire to communicate with others that pushes him on and this may be considered a real motive. But it is quite possible that at least in the early stages his attempts at speaking may be sheer imitative reactions without any specific motives. Again motives in any given situation are dynamic and intermixed. A student's selection of a subject of study may have half a dozen reasons and it may be difficult to say which is more powerful. Then there is the fact of latent learning. Games are made compulsory in schools and several boys dislike them. They have no interest in games but a few weeks later they develop interest in spite of themselves. Learning took place without motives to begin with, and motives developed later on.

The concept of rewards and punishments has been widely used as motivating learning, and all theories of learning agree that the feeling of satisfaction helps to acquire and strengthen learning whether it is conceived as a 'law of effect', or reinforcement. Even psychoanalysts agree that learning is related to the pleasure principle. Rewards may be material and objective as when students wish for a prize or a medal. Or they may be internal and subjective for the satisfaction and pleasure the activity itself affords, as for example the pleasure one derives from a strenuous game of tennis. Again the reduction in or relief of, tension is itself a reward which may motivate learning.

In complex social life of today there is a wide variety of rewards like social approval, power, status, prestige, money, name. The feeling of accomplishment itself is a reward of no mean importance. But the hard realities of life make individual rewards of material type more effective in all learning situations. In vain does the boss try to instil loyalty and devotion into his workers for whom the wage is more important.

Punishments are not so effective in motivating learning as are

rewards, for they bring in their wake conflicts and anxieties which instead of strengthening learning interfere with it. They are at best negative in their import and may produce dislike for the school, hostility toward the teacher and a feeling of inferiority. Perhaps the only punishment that works effectively is the loss of approval and its fear works a strong motivating force.

Social psychology and learning theory

As we have previously emphasized social psychology is interested in human behaviour which is primarily learned rather than inherited. There exists a vast body of literature dealing with experimental studies of learning among animals. Some of these theories are applied to all types of learning and it is quite pertinent to ask if there are any difficulties in applying concepts and assumptions derived from studies of animal learning to complicated forms of human learning.

Most of the theories discussed in this chapter are mechanical approaches to human behaviour and assume that human behaviour is determined by pleasure and pain anticipated from a given course of action. This hedonistic approach is very old—organisms do what satisfies them and refrain from doing what does not satisfy them These theories emphasize external measurable factors in animal learning. For example hunger is measured by the time the animal has gone without food, its performance by the time and speed of its movement and punishment by the strength of the electric shock given to it. By such measurements conclusions become more accurate But such aspects of behaviour as reasoning, understanding, or insight cannot be measured. Language is absent in animal behaviour and is found among men. Very little investigation has been done into the complicated forms of language behaviour.

Secondly, the vast number of studies made in the learning situation interpret learning differently and there is no one accepted theory of learning on which social psychology may rely. They deal with theoretical problems and make no attempt to relate facts of human social life to their findings Those which deal with motivation and rewards and punishments claim to deal with behaviour at the cultural level too, but systematic detailed applications of learning theories to human life at the cultural level are lacking.

The concepts and theories of learning that we have considered so far are derived from the studies of general psychology. General psychology is interested in the processes rather than the products of learning—how the individual learns rather than what he learns. Sociologists and social psychologists on the other hand are concerned more with the product or content of learning, and that is why they emphasize folkways, traditions, mores, conventions and other aspects of social heritage which bear on the behaviour of an individual in society. But social psychology is slightly different in approach from other social sciences. Even while mostly interested in the products of learning it has to concentrate its attention on the social and cultural conditions and situations in which human learning takes place as also to study the general principles which govern that long learning experience by which an individual is socialized and becomes fit to participate in the social and cultural drama being staged around him.

The learning process in social situations

According to Miller and Dollard* the learning process may be analysed into four steps or items: *drive, cue, response* and *reward.* An organism *wants something, sees something, does something* and *gets something.*

The first factor initiates action. The drive may be primary like hunger, thirst, or pain, or secondary like desire for social approval, money or power. Without drive the organism does not behave and therefore does not learn. Behaviour depends on the nature of the individual and the nature of the situation. His internal state, motives, feelings, goals or activity in progress and the way and the degree in which the situation stimulates him determine his response.

The second factor is the preception of the situation, its knowledge and the interpretation of what is observed and known. How a situation is interpreted may be different from how it is objectively seen. The mother tells the child to go and buy ice-candy, but the child hesitates. There are other children crowding round, he does not particularly like one of them, he would like to wait till his friend next door arrives, he would like to show off that he is buying a bigger candy and the like. All this the mother has no means of knowing and yet the child's percep-

* *Social Learning and Limitation*, Yale University Press.

tion of the situation is influenced by these factors.

The third factor is the response without which there is no learning Behaviour is a precondition of all learning It may be bodily behaviour, verbal responses, emotional reactions. Learning to behave in formal social functions or making a speech at a social gathering can be learned only by doing these things. *Learning by doing is a principle which holds good in all types of* learning If responses are satisfying they are learned.

The fourth factor is the 'effect' or the 'reinforcement'. Once rewarded the response is reinforced or strengthened into a well-integrated habit. The reward may be just social approval and most people learn public speaking because of the social approval they get in the initial stages. In the family children learn table manners and social decorum under the approving eyes of parents, and their praise and commendation leads young people to progress along the path of socialization

This plan of the learning process may not be commonly acceptable but this will help to interpret the process of learning in social situations

Products of learning

In a way what is learned or what is the content or product of *learning has already been dealt with. But we may briefly discuss* cuss some of the concepts expressing results of learning The *most readily recognized content is habit In dealing with condi*tioned responses, the law of effect or reinforcement, the formation of habitual modes of behaviour has already been indicated. The term habit is used to refer to organized and learned response patterns that are used repeatedly and automatically Taking our meals and going to the office at a fixed hour are habits. Civilized man has developed a large number of habits like those of putting on clothes, saying 'thank you', letting ladies enter first, taking off shoes before entering the kitchen and the like, and these function to meet our needs and to define our culture. Almost all our activities like eating, dressing, child rearing, working, recreation, relation between sexes and so on are governed by habits The term indicates the degree of stability and perseverance of relationships between the person and the things toward which the person responds.

William James called habits 'second nature'. 'Habit is the

The concepts and theories of learning that we have considered so far are derived from the studies of general psychology. General psychology is interested in the processes rather than the products of learning—how the individual learns rather than what he learns. Sociologists and social psychologists on the other hand are concerned more with the product or content of learning, and that is why they emphasize folkways, traditions, mores, conventions and other aspects of social heritage which bear on the behaviour of an individual in society. But social psychology is slightly different in approach from other social sciences. Even while mostly interested in the products of learning it has to concentrate its attention on the social and cultural conditions and situations in which human learning takes place as also to study the general principles which govern that long learning experience by which an individual is socialized and becomes fit to participate in the social and cultural drama being staged around him.

The learning process in social situations

According to Miller and Dollard* the learning process may be analysed into four steps or items: *drive, cue, response* and *reward*. An organism *wants something, sees something, does something* and *gets something*.

The first factor initiates action. The drive may be primary like hunger, thirst, or pain, or secondary like desire for social approval, money or power. Without drive the organism does not behave and therefore does not learn. Behaviour depends on the nature of the individual and the nature of the situation. His internal state, motives, feelings, goals or activity in progress and the way and the degree in which the situation stimulates him determine his response.

The second factor is the preception of the situation, its knowledge and the interpretation of what is observed and known. How a situation is interpreted may be different from how it is objectively seen. The mother tells the child to go and buy ice-candy, but the child hesitates. There are other children crowding round, he does not particularly like one of them, he would like to wait till his friend next door arrives, he would like to show off that he is buying a bigger candy and the like. All this the mother has no means of knowing and yet the child's percep-

* *Social Learning and Limitation*, Yale University Press.

tion of the situation is influenced by these factors.

The third factor is the response without which there is no learning. Behaviour is a precondition of all learning It may be bodily behaviour, verbal responses, emotional reactions. Learning to behave in formal social functions or making a speech at a social gathering can be learned only by doing these things. Learning by doing is a principle which holds good in all types of learning. If responses are satisfying they are learned.

The fourth factor is the 'effect' or the 'reinforcement'. Once rewarded the response is reinforced or strengthened into a well-integrated habit. The reward may be just social approval and most people learn public speaking because of the social approval they get in the initial stages. In the family children learn table manners and social decorum under the approving eyes of parents, and their praise and commendation leads young people to progress along the path of socialization.

This plan of the learning process may not be commonly acceptable but this will help to interpret the process of learning in social situations.

Products of learning

In a way what is learned or what is the content or product of learning has already been dealt with. But we may briefly discuss some of the concepts expressing results of learning The most readily recognized content is *habit*. In dealing with conditioned responses, the law of effect or reinforcement, the formation of habitual modes of behaviour has already been indicated The term habit is used to refer to organized and learned response patterns that are used repeatedly and automatically. Taking our meals and going to the office at a fixed hour are habits. Civilized man has developed a large number of habits like those of putting on clothes, saying 'thank you', letting ladies enter first, taking off shoes before entering the kitchen and the like, and these function to meet our needs and to define our culture. Almost all our activities like eating, dressing, child rearing, working, recreation, relation between sexes and so on are governed by habits The term indicates the degree of stability and perseverance of relationships between the person and the things toward which the person responds

William James called habits 'second nature'. 'Habit is the

The concepts and theories of learning that we have considered so far are derived from the studies of general psychology. General psychology is interested in the processes rather than the products of learning—how the individual learns rather than what he learns. Sociologists and social psychologists on the other hand are concerned more with the product or content of learning, and that is why they emphasize folkways, traditions, mores, conventions and other aspects of social heritage which bear on the behaviour of an individual in society. But social psychology is slightly different in approach from other social sciences. Even while mostly interested in the products of learning it has to concentrate its attention on the social and cultural conditions and situations in which human learning takes place as also to study the general principles which govern that long learning experience by which an individual is socialized and becomes fit to participate in the social and cultural drama being staged around him.

The learning process in social situations

According to Miller and Dollard* the learning process may be analysed into four steps or items: *drive, cue, response* and *reward.* An organism *wants something, sees something, does something* and *gets something.*

The first factor initiates action. The drive may be primary like hunger, thirst, or pain, or secondary like desire for social approval, money or power. Without drive the organism does not behave and therefore does not learn. Behaviour depends on the nature of the individual and the nature of the situation. His internal state, motives, feelings, goals or activity in progress and the way and the degree in which the situation stimulates him determine his response.

The second factor is the preception of the situation, its knowledge and the interpretation of what is observed and known. How a situation is interpreted may be different from how it is objectively seen. The mother tells the child to go and buy ice-candy, but the child hesitates. There are other children crowding round, he does not particularly like one of them, he would like to wait till his friend next door arrives, he would like to show off that he is buying a bigger candy and the like. All this the mother has no means of knowing and yet the child's percep-

* *Social Learning and Limitation*, Yale University Press.

tion of the situation is influenced by these factors.

'The third factor is the response without which there is no learning. Behaviour is a precondition of all learning. It may be bodily behaviour, verbal responses, emotional reactions. Learning to behave in formal social functions or making a speech at a social gathering can be learned only by doing these things. Learning by doing is a principle which holds good in all types of learning. If responses are satisfying they are learned.

The fourth factor is the 'effect' or the 'reinforcement'. Once rewarded the response is reinforced or strengthened into a well-integrated habit The reward may be just social approval and most people learn public speaking because of the social approval they get in the initial stages. In the family children learn table manners and social decorum under the approving eyes of parents, and their praise and commendation leads young people to progress along the path of socialization.

This plan of the learning process may not be commonly acceptable but this will help to interpret the process of learning in social situations.

Products of learning

In a way what is learned or what is the content or product of learning has already been dealt with. But we may briefly discuss some of the concepts expressing results of learning. The most readily recognized content is *habit*. In dealing with conditioned responses, the law of effect or reinforcement, the formation of habitual modes of behaviour has already been indicated. The term habit is used to refer to organized and learned response patterns that are used repeatedly and automatically Taking our meals and going to the office at a fixed hour are habits. Civilized man has developed a large number of habits like those of putting on clothes, saying 'thank you', letting ladies enter first, taking off shoes before entering the kitchen and the like, and these function to meet our needs and to define our culture Almost all our activities like eating, dressing, child rearing, working, recreation, relation between sexes and so on are governed by habits The term indicates the degree of stability and perseverance of relationships between the person and the things toward which the person responds

William James called habits 'second nature'. 'Habit is the

enormous flywheel of society, its most precious conservative agent. It alone keeps us all within the bounds of ordinance and saves the children of fortune from the envious rising of the poor. . . . It keeps different social strata from mixing. Already at the age of twenty-five you see professional mannerisms settling down on the young commercial traveller, on the young doctor, on the young minister. . . . It is well for the world that in most of us, by the age of thirty, the character has set like plaster, and will never soften again.'* James stressed the social and ethical advantages of habits and it was partly due to his emphasis that habits were given so much importance in social sciences. Later it was recast in terms of 'conditioned response' by the behaviourists till Miller and Dollard preferred the 'habit family' or system of responses. The habit family is simply a class of responses and is defined by reference to some specified goal or end. Any social act is a habit family for it is made up of a mumber of responses directed toward a goal. In a family there is scope for variability, it permits the animal or human being to make different responses to attain the same goal.

John Dewey considered habit as the key to social psychology for it has greater flexibility. It is not a hardened unchangeable connection between responses but includes such concepts as attitudes, interests, viewpoints, purposes. Thus it has a motivational character as has already been pointed out. One may commit murder just once because of the habit of hatred or one may stake his property once because of the inveterate habit of taking risks. Secondly, habits include a reference to the type of situation in which they are learned and are helped by that environment. Each individual learns how to obtain food with the help of others, how to act towards his friends in distress, his boss in anger or his son in temper tantrums. A good deal of social learning or learning from others is organized into habit patterns.

The concept of *attitude* is also of great significance in modern social psychology. In fact no other concept is used more extensively in experimental studies in social psychology. Its popularity may be due to the fact that it is very general and elastic and avoids the controversy of heredity and environment. It may also be applied to a single tendency or a group of tendencies, and there is no doubt that though it may have innate compo-

* *Principles of Psychology*, p. 121.

nents its general pattern is acquired and organized through experience. Several definitions have been offered but they all agree that it is an acquired disposition to behave in a particular way toward objects, persons or situations.

For a long time a distinction used to be drawn between mental and motor attitudes but such an approach meant a dualism of body and mind which is no longer acceptable.

In general, our attitudes are either favourable or unfavourable, reflecting their emotional or motivational character. A child who is burned by hot milk has learned to make a negative response to milk and to avoid it, but one who has been given a sweet biscuit by a hawker develops a positive response to it. These are examples of simple attitudes, but our common attitudes are complex patterns of opinions and beliefs related to self, to other people, to home, family, cinema, government or travelling. Our attitude towards our religion may be made up of a number of things like our belief in God and religious scriptures as also our dislike of ritual, priests and blind superstitions The former components are favourable and the latter are unfavourable. On balance our attitude to religion may still be positive and favourable, and we may continue to attend religious functions on that account. Similarly, our attitude toward our job, family or travelling may be made up of positive and negative components, but we may put up with them because there is no other alternative or on the whole we find them favourable.

Much human conflict is due to the complexity of our attitudes. Our beliefs and actions may not harmonize. We believe a thing to be wrong but we are compelled to do it because of other equally strong needs. This leads to prolonged frustration.

A distinction should be made between attitudes and beliefs An attitude is acquired through learning but it does not necessarily involve any thinking or higher mental processes. In fact most attitudes are formed without such thinking Some animals also develop attitudes. But belief is the result of thinking and implies the acceptance of some proposition or statement as for example our belief that the world is round or that we should worship with folded hands.

Considering that we have given habit a very wide definition the question arises: how does it differ from an attitude? An attitude is acquired from experience and there is every possibility

that with new experience our attitude may change from day to day. People have no hesitation in accepting 'Today my attitude is favourable'. They change their likes and dislikes, and also the ways in which they respond to persons and things, but the term habit is used to denote something stable, persevering and persistent. A person who is habitually generous persistently gives evidence of that attitude or quality.

Modern social psychology attaches very great importance to the study of attitudes. Attitudes are individual mental processes which determine the responses of a person in the social world. Since an attitude is always directed toward some person or object it has been described by some social psychologist as a mental state of the individual. Newcomb speaks of attitude as a 'state of readiness for a motive arousal', it is a predisposition to perform, perceive, think and feel in relation to it. It would be desirable to reserve the term *attitude* to indicate what we are prepared to do, and *opinion* to denote what we are prepared to believe or consider as true. In a subsequent chapter we shall return to the subject in detail.

The term *sentiment* has lately fallen into disuse, but it closely related to both habits and attitudes. McDougall defined sentiment as 'an organized system of emotional dispositions centred about the idea of some object'. According to him, 'The theory of sentiments is the theory of progressive organization of the propensities (instincts) in systems which become the main sources of all our activities; systems which give consistency, continuity and order to our life of striving and emotion; systems which in turn become organized in larger systems, and which, when harmoniously organized in one comprehensive system, constitute what we properly call character.'*

A sentiment differs from an attitude in many respects. In the first place it is based on propensities or instincts while attitudes have no such basis. Secondly, sentiments are organized round specific objects as love or hatred is directed towards some definite person, but a sneering or patronizing attitude is a general approach. Thirdly, sentiments tend to be organized in an hierarchy, one powerful sentiment driving all others, but attitudes are not so organized. Lastly, sentiments function at the conscious level while attitudes may be both conscious and unconscious.

* *Social Psychology*, p. 211.

The concept of sentiment was used systematically, first by Shand and later popularized by W. McDougall. Sentiment was considered by them as a unit for the theory of personality and McDougall argues that all our sentiments are organized into a system under the all-pervading sentiment for self-regard.

These products of learning show that some sort of a persistent and stable disposition underlies all social behaviour. This does not mean that there is no flexibility for habits, attitudes and sentiments are not static unchangeable phenomena As environment changes and new situations demand new responses, individuals try to adjust themselves within the framework of what they have already learned.

Human learning leads to the development of *values and ideals*. In the course of his experience the individual learns that some goals and motives are preferable to others. He has a large number of needs, goals and demands and they are not always compatible. So he is obliged to organize them into some sort of an hierarchy in which some of them have a priority over others or are more important than others Such precedence or preference of some needs over others has its roots in the comparative values of drives and motives Do men prefer food to prestige? Will they prefer to starve rather than submit to humiliating conditions of work? Some people do and some people do not. It depends largely on the situation and the state of the individual. It is out of such experiences and situations that values arise. Values are objects toward which we direct our desires and through social experience we invest them with moral justification. The values of an Indian are different from the values of a Chinese, and this may prevent them from understanding each other. Ideals are long-range ends toward which we may strive and they grow out of cultural standards of thought and conduct obtaining in any society. They are rooted in man's desires but through imagination are projected into future goals

Frames of reference •

Before concluding this chapter we may deal with a new concept which has been recently introduced to stress the influence of social factors in perception. We have seen above that perceptual and cognitive properties of a stimulus are determined in a large measure by the properties of the whole of which it is a part,

that is, it is perceived in relation to other stimuli with which it is organized. This truth is embodied in what Sherif calls *frame of reference.* It is the context or standards which serve as a means of judging the experience in question or placing it in the proper framework. It includes all the related factors, past and present, which work at the moment to determine the character of perception or judgement.

Illustrations of frames of reference are found in most of the psychological phenomena. A boy is tall when he is playing among smaller children and short when moving about among college students. We see people differently in a formal tea party, in a club, in the office, or in their family. Such differences in perception are determined by frames of reference. Perception of any single stimulus is changed as the stimuli to which it is related are changed.

Now if stimuli are well organized our perception is definite and the number of ways in which we can experience them is limited. But if the stimulus is unrelated to other objects, has no reference to time and place, and is without any clear beginning or end, perception is rendered uncertain and the effects of social influences like personal suggestions, group demands, newspaper emphases, majority opinions or party viewpoints will be much greater. An individual's own attitudes or motives in relation to stimuli will also be involved. The well known story of a bird's singing being interpreted by a devout Hindu as *Sita Rama Dashrath,* by a devout Muslim as *Subhan Teri Kudrat* and by a petty merchant as *Loon Tel Adrak* (salt, oil and ginger) very aptly illustrates the effect of frames of reference. We shall return to this subject in subsequent chapters.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

BARTLETT, F. C. *Remembering, A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology,* Cambridge University Press.

LINDGREEN, H. C. and BYRNE, D. *Psychology, An Introduction to the Study of Human Behaviour* (New York and London: John Wiley & Sons).

KRECH, D. and CRUTCHFIELD, R. S. *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc.).

SHERIF, M. and SHERIF, C. *An Outline of Social Psychology*, revised edition (New York: Harper & Brothers)

SARGENT, S. S and WILLIAMSON, R. C. *Social Psychology* (New York: The Ronald Press Company).

HILGARD, E. R. *Theories of Learning* (New York· Appleton-Century-Crofts)

GUTHRIE, E. R. *The Psychology of Learning* (New York: Harper).

BLAKE, R. R. and RAMSEY, G. V. *Perception, An Approach to Personality* (New York: *Ronald Press*)

CHAPTER VI

SOCIAL LEARNING AND INTERACTION

THE MAIN SUBJECT of study in social psychology is how people behave and learn in social situations, and how they learn to function as members of the society in which they are born. Social learning refers to knowledge, skill, attitudes and values which an individual acquires as a result of his frequent, repeated and prolonged contact and experience with other people. All social learning is the consequence of day-to-day interaction with other members of society.

The process of social learning is long and complicated and it takes every individual long to be able to participate in the adult culture in any civilized society. Whereas in many primitive cultures young people in their teens are able to assume adult roles and obligations, in civilized society they are expected to play a variety of complex roles. Not only are they expected to learn to play a wide variety of roles but they have to learn to match their roles to social situations. These roles impart a status to the adult and imply an acceptance of the norms prescribed by society. That is why human children in comparison with the young ones of higher animals take more than twenty years to be absorbed in adult society.

It is obvious that most of this social learning takes place through our interaction with others. Modes of behaviour, habits, attitudes or values which form the major dimensions of our personalities are acquired through our interaction with others.

Kimball Young affirms that social learning consists largely of responses that are *learned from others.* 'Because of the way in which a man is coupled to the environment it is necessary to study man's actions as part of a larger system of events. To deal effectively with larger systems, it will be necessary for us briefly to mention one of the most important concepts that has been

developed in the behavioural sciences. This is the concept of *culture*. Culture is learned. Moreover it is learned from other persons. Gradually, the culture comes to affect the individual in what he thinks, what he believes and how he acts. Culture is an expanding and persisting accumulation of ways of doing and thinking which one generation hands down to the next. In fact, culture represents a kind of expected behaviour which individuals require of those around them: parents of children, preachers of parish members, teachers of pupils, leaders of followers, and so on. At this point we are concerned largely with the manner in which the individual learns or acquires his culture and other aspects of learned behaviour."*

We have already outlined the general principles of learning and analysed the learning process also. Those facts and principles apply to social learning as well. Kimball Young stresses that social learning is *learning from*, and goes on to point out that it means that the learned responses of at least two persons are alike and that the learned responses of one person are dependent upon the responses of the other. When the child learns to hold the tea-cup from his mother it means that he holds it in the same manner as his mother does and his manner of holding the tea-cup was dependent on the manner his mother held it. This should not imply that social learning is a one-way traffic. The modification of behaviour which results is mutual. May be that the mother also has learned that her manner of holding the tea-cup needs improvement.

There may be some learning which does not involve social interaction. One may avoid touching live electric wires without bringing in any other person, but sooner or later some reference to other people is sure to be made

We have already outlined the main processes involved in social interaction in the first chapter and we turn to them now for detailed discussion.

Types of social stimulation

Social behaviour is stimulated by other individuals, either in actual perception or in thought. Social situations vary and so does social behaviour from one social situation to another. A person is meek and docile in the presence of his superiors but

* *Handbook of Social Psychology*, p 48

hand may give rise to quite a different impression.

Some gestures are demonstrative and serve to direct the attention of other people to some object, person or situation, as raising a finger or turning of the eye towards some object or person. Some gestures are symbolic as they stand for abstract thoughts, as for example the several postures and *mudras* in Indian dance-drama. Some gestures are reactions to one's own internal conflicts. Shrugging shoulders or shuffling one's feet may indicate inner restlessness or impatience. They have a clear social stimulus value.

Posture and movement of the limbs are expressive of attitudes, feelings and approach of the person. A person who walks straight, with sprightly steps, flourishing his arms and with his chin up, is in good health, assertive, confident and hopeful. But one who is drooping, bent, slow and with arms locked behind is moody, anxious, and thoughtful. Both will arouse different responses among the people they meet and talk to.

Physical features, particularly the face of a person as it looks, arouse our like and dislike. Some people are very attractive to look at, some people have very charming eyes but a very ugly nose, and some people positively repel us by their very looks. This is no judgement on their character or ability but is just a response which their looks evoke.

Speech has a powerful stimulus value. People react very strongly and clearly to what others say. But what is the motive behind the use of words or speech? What are the basic functions of language? The first is the social function of communication, conveying thoughts and feelings to others and controlling the behaviour of others by orders and requests to fulfil certain needs. The former is illustrated by the teacher's lessons and the second by the orders or requests of parents to children to do certain things. F. H. Allport maintains that the primary motive behind the use of language is the desire to induce or order response in other people for the satisfaction of their needs and the desire to communicate thought and knowledge is a later development. Another function of language is to provide expression to strong emotions and feelings. Profane language into which an individual drifts under emotional stress provides a relief to over-burdened mind. And lastly, language helps thinking. Words are pegs on which we hang our thoughts and it is

through language that thinking grows and develops. Here we are mainly concerned with the social stimulus value of speech which is strongly demonstrated by the great influence exercised by leaders, religious preachers, teachers, advertisers on the behaviour of common people through well-chosen words charged with emotion and uttered with emphasis. It is not merely words which carry weight, the accent, the pitch of the voice, etc. change the meanings. 'Very bad' uttered in different ways may mean disgust, annoyance, tolerance, regret or just teasing. 'Thank you' may express gratitude, formal courtesy, impudence or resentment according as it is spoken. Many words being used indiscriminately and repeated in all contexts do not mean anything at all. Most Westerners say 'fine' in so large a variety of situations that nobody attaches any significance to it.

Again spoken language reveals the educational and cultural standard of the person, the region or district he comes from and the like. A Punjabi, Bengali or South Indian can be known from the way he speaks English

The social stimulus value of *laughter* is very great and manifold. Although laughter has been variously interpreted by different thinkers our interest is in its stimulus value in social behaviour. There is a large body of pertinent material on the subject. Hobbes thought laughter arises out of a feeling of sudden glory or feeling of superiority induced by the misfortunes of others. We are amused at the manners and customs of people different from ourselves. It spread the notion that it is not nice to laugh. But we also laugh at incongruity in a situation. But this incongruity is a defect or inferiority which amuses us because we feel superior. Bergson's theory is that laughter is a social corrective and we laugh at others because we wish to correct some incongruity or incompatibility, just as we laugh at a pompous person slipping on the road. We laugh at others when their dress, speech or manner of behaviour is clumsy, to stiff or snobbish.

But we also laugh *with* others. Spencer thinks such laughter is an overflow of surplus energy. A difficult task demanding a great deal of energy turns out to be very simple and we spent the surplus energy in laughing and making merry. Laughter is infectious and induces a feeling of companionship and cements the bonds of friendship. People who laugh together have some-

thing in common and a great deal of goodwill for each other. Many speakers begin or end with a humorous anecdote and thus create an atmosphere of goodwill and sympathy for themselves. Such laughter induced in groups disarms criticism and hostility if any.

There are several other kinds of laughter which have a value for social stimulation. We smile to others to show our courtesy, goodwill and regard. Ridicule is used in many families and communities as a means of social control to prevent deviations from traditional ways. In some communities like the Chinese and the Japanese a smile is the correct expression when narrating a calamity to one's superior. If a junior smiles or laughs when he is reprimanded his offence is aggravated and he is more severely punished. Sometimes people laugh loudly just to attract attention, to hide their depression or to seek relief from a tension.

Laughter is conditioned to particular situations. We do not laugh in a church or temple, court room or in a business meeting, but we let ourselves go in a theatre, playground or club-house. Often laughter of one person induces laughter in others and they continue to laugh because they are laughing together, stimulating each other to laugh more and more.

Modes of social interaction

How two or more individuals or groups interact has been the subject of study by both sociologists and social psychologists, but we are mostly concerned with the processes involved in social interaction. People are always coming in contact with each other, stimulating each other in a variety of ways and arousing in others many types of responses at the same time. There are different ways in which the complex interactive processes may be analysed for purposes of detailed study, but we have selected for particular emphasis the processes of *communication, adjustment, co-operation, competition* and *conflict.*

Communication

There is little doubt that communication is the heart of all social living and intergroup behaviour. We communicate for imparting knowledge accurately, for relating facts, for understanding each other, for entertainment, for presenting different

points of view and for influencing the behaviour of others. It is commonly believed that failure in teaching and learning, tensions and conflicts in the family, neighbourhood and clubs, lack of harmony between labour and employers, international prejudices and the 'cold war' between two power blocs are all failures of communication. And in a way they are because correct and clear communication is basic to mutual understanding and appreciation.

True communication is possible only when man develops gestures and symbols which have the same meaning for the person for whom they are used as they have for the person who makes them. These gestures or symbols may be a spoken or written word or just some bodily movements. The students can understand and acquire knowledge from the teacher if he uses words which they comprehend. Traffic can be easily controlled because drivers attach the same meaning to red and green lights or the signboards 'stop' at crossings. The gestures of the policeman are understood by drivers because both attach the same meaning to them. If they were to attach different meanings, or there were new symbols like yellow or blue light there would be no communication Labourers, refugees and hundreds of other needy people are able to seek redress of their grievances through the use of language. And the achievements of the race in knowledge, custom and skill are communicated through the use of words. In fact language is an important means of human socialization. The more a child grows in the use of language the more he is able to participate in adult social living, for it is through communication that he is able to share his experiences and thoughts with others.

Gestures are limited in number and scope and they are not so significant as words written or spoken.

Very often the need of having an international language is stressed because the finer shades of thought and meaning are not clearly and accurately communicated through translation An important fact to be considered in connection with communication is that of *feedback*. Feedback is a process by which an individual gets a report of the effect of his behaviour and is thus able to modify his behaviour. It is of great importance in communication for the speaker looking at the faces and reactions of his listeners is able to modify his speech according to

how he interprets their reactions. Obviously there is scope for lot of misunderstanding. If the hearer is silent and still, it may be interpreted as lack of interest or concentrated interest and attention. Generally experienced teachers and leaders are able to know correctly how the class or the audience is responding.

Language is a great help in communicating but if there can be so much misunderstanding in the use of one language how much more misunderstanding is likely to occur when the numerous communities and nations of the world use such a large variety of language. That is why attempts have been made to set up a world language like Basic English of Ogden, Esperanto, or Interlingua. The claims of English as an international language are pressed with justification as it is a very flexible language used by a large section of people all over the world. But the greatest obstacle is that sentiment and culture are so closely wedded to language that people are not inclined to use a foreign language however flexible it may be.

Adjustment

The processes of adjustment and maladjustment have been treated in detail in a previous chapter. Adjustment is the relationship which comes to be established between the individual and his environment. In all social living every individual has a position to occupy and a role to play though he may not be always conscious of it. If his experience and training have so shaped his personality that he is well prepared to play the roles which are expected of a person of his status and position in any given social environment and if his basic needs are met by playing such roles, we may say his adjustments are good. On the other hand if his experiences and training have not adequately prepared him to play such roles relevant to his status in society, if his basic needs are not satisfied by such roles or if society does not accord him a status he thinks it is his due, his adjustments are not good, and he is maladjusted. In a previous chapter the several types of maladjustments commonly found have been described in detail and all that remains to be dealt with is the process of positive adjustment.

Each culture has its own social pattern in which people have definite ranks and are expected to do certain types of work. These ranks are based on age, sex, place of residence, occupa-

tion, physical appearance, attitudes and the like. A rank is an individual's *status* in society and represents the activity or function with which he is associated and which carries with it some power or prestige. Social psychologists use the world social status or social standing to indicate the position which a person occupies in a society. This position is determined by the ways in which he is expected to act and behave toward other persons, and the ways in which they are expected to act and behave toward him. The status carries certain rights and obligations with regard to his fellow men What the individual is called upon to do or perform is his *role* in that group. In order to fit into society every person must play a definite and predictable role, and this ability to play a constant role has to be required.

The family pattern in each culture is also different so that each member is expected to have certain attitudes and beliefs and to behave and work in a certain way The father, the mother and children have different statuses in the family and play very different roles.

The same person has a different status in different groups and also different roles to play in different social contexts. He is a father at home, an officer in relation to his subordinates in the office, a secretary of the club, a driver on the road, a member of the rate-payers' association and so on In different social situations he plays different roles His role is the dynamic aspect of his status and his adjustment is the agreement or harmony between his status and his role If the status of a judge is combined with the role of a corrupt coward, if the status of a teacher is combined with the role of a petty hater of children, or if the status of a doctor is combined with the role of a careless and unkind person, there is maladjustment and social disorganization. Social adjustment depends on harmony between status-assuming and role-playing

There are a number of processes which work in the social process of adjustment and they should be understood by all students of social behaviour and interaction *Accommodation* is making adjustments in a conflicting situation Two individuals or groups come into conflict but unable to get away from each other succeed in establishing some sort of a working relationship. It is a sort of compromise with a difficult social situation and conflict is somehow postponed If there are two parties

contending for a position of dominance accommodation is reached by one party accepting a subordinate position. In an hierarchy of ranks in offices and departments people are constantly accommodating each other by playing a subordinate role to their colleagues in points of dispute. In every home there is bound to be accommodation between husband and wife for a harmonious and effective working of the family. They may have different habits, interests, values or ideas about things, and often there is a clash in the beginning, each insisting on his own point of view and there arises a lot of misunderstanding. But with the passage of time there is give-and-take and even though they do not see eye to eye they give in to each other.

In the international sphere where conflicts and prejudices abound we speak of different nations accommodating each other. The caste Hindus are accommodating the Harijans, and there is greater mutual toleration among Hindus and Muslims. On the one hand laws and on the other conferences are processes of accommodation to resolve conflict among individuals and groups.

Another process subordinate to adjustment is that of *assimilation* in which different individuals and groups living together and sharing experiences acquire each others' sentiments and attitudes. When Punjabi Hindus migrated from Pakistan their habits and values came into sharp contrast and conflict with the habits and values of people in Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan. Gradually they began to accommodate themselves to the new ways of thinking and acting, and in course of time their modes of living, talking and thinking so harmonized with those of the new state that they became almost one with them. This is assimilation. It is not so complete with adults but the younger generation got more quickly assimilated. In fact their problem was to adjust to the conflict between the ways of their parents at home and those of their classmates in the school. Marriage is another case of complete assimilation in which after several years of living together husband and wife have the same interests, goals, attitudes and ideas.

Co-operation

Co-operation is working together for a common end which cannot be achieved through individual effort. Modern civilized living is largely a co-operative affair. Schools and colleges, reli-

gious institutions, business houses, industrial plants or government machinery cannot function without active co-operation between those associated with them. Co-operation is working together without conflict, and human society is so constituted that mutual dependence for the satisfaction of one's needs is the rule rather than an exception. After the last World War there has been a growing desire among various nations to co-operate in all areas and programmes of economic and cultural development and in the settlement of international disputes. A number of international organizations are working to help the development of backward countries and to bridge the gulf between 'haves' and 'have-nots'. It is hoped that such co-operation may pave the way for peace and security in the world which has so far been elusive

Nearer home the Indian Government is encouraging co-operatives for village administration and distribution of consumers' goods because it is believed that shared responsibility helps to improve both the quantity and the quality of work. There is a great psychological advantage too. Co-operative behaviour, shared responsibility and working together creates a feeling of mutual belonging, a sense of mutualness and companionship and a warmth of friendship and intimacy, and is a powerful force in social integration and cohesiveness Neighbouring ladies work together at a marriage celebration. Not only do they cover a larger portion of the work in less time but are able to attend to details, correct each other and produce better effect. Besides there grows a spirit of fellowship and belonging together. Co-operation in celebrating school festivals or organizing games and sports heightens the tempo of work and is always an exhilarating experience.

Sociologists and social psychologists are very much exercised about the origin of co-operative behaviour Recently some experimental studies have been made of co-operative behaviour among animals. It is obvious that co-operation among insects though highly organized to look at shows little sign of purpose There is evidence of co-operation among chimpanzees but it is one-sided and not mutual in the sense in which co-operation among human beings is found. Among men there is teamwork, mutual give-and-take rendered effective by prior understanding and communication.

Competition

Competition is mutual rivalry. It is striving to equal or surpass the speed, quality or amount of another person's or group's performance. It is not so much a specific act as an attitude of mind which dictates the level of aspiration and the estimation of the performance of other people. Often a distinction is made between competition and rivalry, the former standing for the reciprocal interplay of behaviour in face-to-face situations and the latter for the desire to surpass or equal other people in skill, prestige, wealth and the like. Rivalry may be found among people engaged in entirely different activities. One may be selling soap, another cloth and still another engaged in service.

Competition may be between two individuals, an individual and a group or between two groups.

Modern civilized living is essentially competitive and everybody seems to be running a race to secure ascendance or excel somebody. Social training encourages competitive spirit and our culture approves competitive behaviour. In all walks of life and areas of work competition is rampant, and young people are stimulated in every way possible to strive to surpass and excel others. Success and achievement in life is measured only in terms of feeling of superiority or ascendance.

Several experimental studies have been made of the origin and effectiveness of competition. Some of them emphasize that children work better and harder when they are competing with others and that competition tends to stimulate greater individual output. Another study showed that competition is most effective when competitors are nearly equal. One study showed that some individuals are easily discouraged by competitive situations and prefer to withdraw from the race.

Some effects of competition are not good. For one thing it tends to lower the cohesiveness of the group and encourages disruptive tendencies. Secondly, psychoanalysts rightly point out that too much of competition breeds frustration and anxiety and consequently neurotic conflicts. When everybody is running in the race he is hyper-anxious to excel and defeat others. Mahatma Gandhi believed that exaggerated competitiveness of our age is responsible for such social ills as exploitation, class conflicts, disparities in living standards and consequent social tensions, international prejudices and homicidal wars. It also breeds the

psychological poison of hatred and jealousy. The present system of examinations has all the evils indicated here because it *is based on competition, individual effort, and personal achievement.*

Because competition is so widespread in our age many people are inclined to believe that the drive to compete is innate. This is not so Competition is essentially a social process which arises when any commodity, material or non-material is in short supply or the demand outstrips the supply.

Competition versus co-operation

Several studies have been made to assess the relative advantages of competition and co-operation. Although competition marks the most significant and powerful trend in modern social living, its importance differs from one culture to another. American children have been found to work harder and more effectively when they compete with others and Americans generally are prone to be competitive, for example, more competitive than Indians M. Mead speaks of societies like the Zuni Indians of the American Southwest, the BaThonga of Africa, and the Eskimos, being very little competitive. Even in our own society there are groups which are less competitive, the degree of competitiveness varying from one area of life to another And there are large individual differences

In both types of interaction, co-operation and competition, the participants must have a motive, that is, must be in a state of drive, they must have a goal which they believe can be achieved through working together or against each other, and there must be present tendencies which will inhibit co-operation and encourage competition, and vice-versa. In co-operation the participants believe that the common goal can be reached better and earlier by working together, and in competition they believe that working together will not help. In the former they have a common goal to be shared by all and co-operation is more effective if the share of each person is more or less equal On the other hand competition is more effective when the goals cannot be shared.

Generally both co-operation and competition are found in all social activity and interaction A game of cricket, a committee meeting, work in a classroom or life in a family involves both

Competition

Competition is mutual rivalry. It is striving to equal or surpass the speed, quality or amount of another person's or group's performance. It is not so much a specific act as an attitude of mind which dictates the level of aspiration and the estimation of the performance of other people. Often a distinction is made between competition and rivalry, the former standing for the reciprocal interplay of behaviour in face-to-face situations and the latter for the desire to surpass or equal other people in skill, prestige, wealth and the like. Rivalry may be found among people engaged in entirely different activities. One may be selling soap, another cloth and still another engaged in service.

Competition may be between two individuals, an individual and a group or between two groups.

Modern civilized living is essentially competitive and everybody seems to be running a race to secure ascendance or excel somebody. Social training encourages competitive spirit and our culture approves competitive behaviour. In all walks of life and areas of work competition is rampant, and young people are stimulated in every way possible to strive to surpass and excel others. Success and achievement in life is measured only in terms of feeling of superiority or ascendance.

Several experimental studies have been made of the origin and effectiveness of competition. Some of them emphasize that children work better and harder when they are competing with others and that competition tends to stimulate greater individual output. Another study showed that competition is most effective when competitors are nearly equal. One study showed that some individuals are easily discouraged by competitive situations and prefer to withdraw from the race.

Some effects of competition are not good. For one thing it tends to lower the cohesiveness of the group and encourages disruptive tendencies. Secondly, psychoanalysts rightly point out that too much of competition breeds frustration and anxiety and consequently neurotic conflicts. When everybody is running in the race he is hyper-anxious to excel and defeat others. Mahatma Gandhi believed that exaggerated competitiveness of our age is responsible for such social ills as exploitation, class conflicts, disparities in living standards and consequent social tensions, international prejudices and homicidal wars. It also breeds the

psychological poison of hatred and jealousy. The present system of examinations has all the evils indicated here because it is based on *competition, individual effort, and personal achievement.*

Because competition is so widespread in our age many people are inclined to believe that the drive to compete is innate. This is not so. Competition is essentially a social process which arises when any commodity, material or non-material is in short supply or the demand outstrips the supply.

Competition versus co-operation

Several studies have been made to assess the relative advantages of competition and co-operation. Although competition marks the most significant and powerful trend in modern social living, its importance differs from one culture to another. American children have been found to work harder and more effectively when they compete with others and Americans generally are prone to be competitive, for example, more competitive than Indians. M. Mead speaks of societies like the Zuni Indians of the American Southwest, the BaThonga of Africa, and the Eskimos, *being very little competitive. Even in our own society* there are groups which are less competitive, the degree of competitiveness varying from one area of life to another. And there are large individual differences.

In both types of interaction, co-operation and competition, the participants must have a motive, that is, must be in a state of drive, they must have a goal which they believe can be achieved through working together or against each other, and there must be present tendencies which will inhibit co-operation and encourage competition, and vice-versa. In co-operation the participants believe that the common goal can be reached better and earlier by working together, and in competition they believe that working together will not help. In the former they have a common goal to be shared by all and co-operation is more effective if the share of each person is more or less equal. On the other hand competition is more effective when the goals cannot be shared.

Generally both co-operation and competition are found in all social activity and interaction. A game of cricket, a committee meeting, work in a classroom or life in a family involves both

competition and co-operation. Individuals strive for personal success and glory as well as work for group achievement and prestige. This is best brought out by saying that co-operation is group-oriented and depends on attitudes and feelings of good-will and friendship for others. Competition is self-oriented and its effects tend to divide and disorganize the group.

Usually people take to competition when co-operation fails to achieve the end. People jump the queue when standing in the queue does not help. When the rule of law which seeks to secure the goods for all fails, there is jostling, elbowing and competition. But after the two World Wars humanity is seeking its salvation in international understanding and co-operation, and progressive nations are helping under-developed and backward nations to develop in many ways, educationally, industrially and culturally.

One of the most carefully made studies of co-operation and competition is that of Deutsch. He had two groups, one competitive, the other co-operative each of which was divided into five teams and provided rewards according as they worked individually or together on some intellectual problems including group discussion on problems of human relations. Members of the competitive group were told that they would be ranked individually on the basis of their contribution to discussion and solution of the problem, and members of the co-operative group were told that they would be judged on the merit of their performance as a group. He found that the co-operative groups showed greater and better productivity, greater mutual understanding, greater co-ordination of efforts, greater friendliness during discussion and a higher degree of member satisfaction and effectiveness. The members had a strong motivation to work hard at the group task, felt greater consideration for, and obligation to, each other, and had a strong desire to win the respect of other members.

In almost all civilized societies socialistic tendencies are gaining ground and there is a growing desire to encourage co-operative enterprises. But co-operation will thrive only when the system of rewards is so rationalized that there is a close integration between individual motives and group goals, when there is a greater realization that no individual can realize his goal without also promoting the fulfilment of other members of his group,

and when social consciousness is so highly developed that members of any group feel that their lives and fortunes are tied together. In such a situation individual goals are not subordinated to group welfare but there is an identity of individual and group goals and interests.

On the other hand competition or trying to excel other persons working in the same geographical area is a very important form of social motivation In our culture we are so conditioned that most often we accept the conduct of other people as a challenge to greater effort. Competitive trends were so widespread that many writers considered them instinctive. Today the degree and extent of competition is believed to be largely determined by social and cultural emphasis Sensing danger in the exaggerated development of competition in the modern world social thinkers have begun to stress auto-competition in which the individual competes with his own previous performance and strives to excel it.

Conflict

The last mode of social interaction to be considered is *conflict*. Conflict with which we dealt previously was mental conflict. This is interpersonal conflict or opposition in which individuals or groups seek to attain a goal under such conditions that the greater the immediate or direct success of one individual or group, the less the immediate or direct success of others Conflict includes competition but involves face-to-face relationship and is accompanied by emotional responses Competition is impersonal and seldom involves deep emotion But very often competition develops into conflict, particularly when the forces against which one is competing are identified with persons. Competing for victory in games or for sitting space in crowded trains people start fighting with each other

Conflict is a universal social process though it varies in amount and intensity among different social structures. Even in societies known for peaceful and co-operative ways and institutions conflict and aggression is found in one form or the other. Personal aggressiveness usually arises from frustrations which individuals experience in their relations with their fellowmen. Just as affection and sympathy is extended from the family to people outside similarly aggressiveness and conflict which arises

primarily against family training and discipline is transferred to social situations outside the home.

How people fight is regulated by their culture pattern. Among ancient Aryans even deadly enemies never hit below the belt or took advantage of the fallen enemy. In the West 'duelling' was carefully regulated and there are codes and conventions to be followed in international warfare even today.

McDougall and psychologists of his way of thinking maintain that conflict is due to the instinct of pugnacity or aggressiveness. Social scientists do not accept this and trace it to past experience and cultural factors. Strict discipline in the family and strict regulation of social life by laws and controls lead to frustrations and aggressive reactions. In a rapidly changing social order there is always a conflict between the old and the young, between tradition and freedom, between conformity and novelty. Modern India developing at a much faster rate is full of social conflicts among various groups, but of these we shall speak in detail later.

Some factors in social interaction

In social learning and interaction there are certain factors which play a very effective role. They are *imitation, suggestion* and *sympathy*. William James and Baldwin regarded imitation as instinctive, but McDougall believed that it should not be regarded as instinctive because it does not imply any specific form of behaviour as all instincts do and its expression varies from one situation to another. He called it a general tendency. Brown calls them purely descriptive concepts. F. H. Allport's 'social facilitation' and Blumer's 'social contagion' are also very much in line to describe events in collective interaction. Sargent calls them 'one-way' interactions in contrast to two-way interactions discussed above. But there is no denying the fact that they are powerful and pervasive mechanisms in social interaction and learning and therefore deserve careful and detailed discussion and treatment in any book on social psychology. But it is doubtful if imitation, suggestion, or sympathy can ever be used as principles of explanation. They only describe what happens in social interaction. Suggestion refers to the knowledge aspect that one's thoughts, beliefs and opinions are very much influenced by those of others. Imitation means that one's

actions are influenced by the actions of his fellowmen. And sympathy means experiencing a certain emotion on perceiving its expression in another individual. The three correspond to the cognitive, conative and effective aspects of life and behaviour. Let us study them in detail.

Imitation

Bagehat thought that imitation was an explanatory principle and said: 'Society is imitation' It continues to be held together and moulded by imitation. Fashions in dress, forms of political behaviour, religious beliefs and practices and even literary styles spread and come to be accepted because of imitation. But the first systematic account of imitation was presented by Tarde who built upon it a theory of the nature of society Imitation for him was the fundamental social fact, and there were laws which described its nature and its effect. Social change is possible because people imitate the striking and the new. Society without imitation is unthinkable

There are two types of imitation Children smile or cry when others are smiling or crying This is primary imitation. Children learn to speak and use a language by primary imitation But they learn to write by deliberately and consciously imitating how others write This is generalized imitation

Tarde, Ross and McDougall stress the great value and importance of imitation The continuity of culture, of traditions and customs, of the ways of eating, dressing, thinking and living, is possible because of imitation Imitation is a great conservative force in society, it is essential to social progress, and by bringing about similarity in language, dress, opinions, religious beliefs, forms of art and literature it works for social solidarity and cohesiveness

But modern social psychologists and sociologists do not attach so much importance to imitation. Its role is not so pervasive according to them Even children who imitate much more than adults are very selective in what and how they imitate. Parents and teachers complain that children do not imitate the correct models presented Not all fads and fashions are adopted Some of them miserably fail to catch, others have a short life, and a few are incorporated into the culture In every group, family, community or nation there are rebels and non-conformists

who refuse to follow others in every way and aspect of thought and life. Among human beings as among animals there seems always to be a selection from a number of possibilities, and imitation occurs only when it brings about some kind of satisfaction. The important question is not that people imitate others but who imitates whom and under what conditions imitation takes place. A child imitates his father in walking but does not imitate his speech. He imitates his mother in speech but not in puckering lips. Only a certain film star is imitated for his hair cut style, another is imitated for his gait and still another is imitated for his 'drain-pipe' pants.

Imitation takes place under certain conditions and does not take place under others. What are such conditions? People imitate when this type of behaviour enables them to meet a need or reach a goal. There is no force of imitating but certain underlying conditions bring about imitation. Young men put on 'drain-pipe' pants not because the force of imitation compels them but because they consider it a means of living the type of life they cherish. People imitate because what they imitate has a meaning and importance for them. A number of experiments made by Miller and Dollard show that we do not learn by imitation but we learn to imitate. Learning from others is possible only when the learner has understood the meaning of the action he has imitated and when he has noted its relevance to the given conditions. Such an imitation is an intelligent process.

Often similarity of behaviour is mistaken for imitation. When all motorists stop on seeing the red signal, all spectators laugh at a joke in the film or guests leave together, it is not necessarily an indication of imitation. They may all be responding to the same stimulus situation rather than imitating one another.

We may conclude that imitation is not so pervasive, we do not imitate everything and everybody, imitation is selective, behaviour described as imitative can be explained in a variety of ways, similarity of behaviour is not imitation, and when imitation does take place it may be means to an end, that is, the act imitated has a value and is understood as a satisfactory solution to a problem. 'There is no drive to imitate', as Otto Klineberg puts it.*

* *Social Psychology*, p. 442.

Suggestion

Suggestion is the uncritical or unreasoned acceptance of ideas from others and when a person is inclined to accept uncritically a statement made by another person he is said to be 'suggestible'. 'Suggestible' and 'suggestibility' refer to the passive state of the person receiving suggestions. When film stars, champion athletes, or busy salesmen recommend a certain brand of soap, there are many suggestions carried along with their statements. It is suggested that the soap is good for complexion like that of a film star, that it is the best of its kind, you acquire the qualities of such outstandingly successful people if you use the soap they use. Numerous experiments are cited of the efficacy of suggestion: How a dead wire gives a shock when the button is pressed, how a chemistry student reports smell from an odourless liquid, or how children are frightened by a striking picture of a cat.

It may be noted that persons differ in their readiness to accept suggestions from others, that is, some are more suggestible than others and there are degrees of suggestibility. Suggestibility is greatest during hypnosis, in states marked by excessive fatigue or prolonged emotion and in the exalted states produced by drugs like alcohol Many researches have been made into factors favouring or determining suggestibility. Although there are wide individual differences in suggestibility it has been seen that children from the age of five to eight are more suggestible than at any other age, that girls and women are more suggestible than boys and men, and that ignorance makes people more suggestible Whether there is any correlation between intelligence and suggestibility has not been established Crowds are more suggestible than individuals comprising them. Suggestibility is not a personality trait because it is often greatly affected by changes in environment and mental and bodily states People in the throes of emotions lose their heads and power of logical thinking, and are an easy prey to suggestions of others

Mesmer in the latter part of the eighteenth century talked of 'animal magnetism' but it was left to Le Bon to present a systematic account of the general mechanism of suggestion by which he tried to explain the behaviour of crowds, but as has already been pointed out, suggestion is not universally effective. The suggestions of communist leaders are effective only in a communist society, of religious leaders only in their own following

and of military leaders only during the war.

Suggestions may work directly or indirectly. Parents, teachers, salesmen or leaders use direct suggestions to influence other people's behaviour by calling upon them to behave in a specific manner. In indirect suggestion the aim is concealed by the use of certain devices or media: 'Millions find relief this way', 'Better than the best imported radio', 'A good boy speaks the truth', and so on are indirect suggestions working to control behaviour in the interest of the suggester when the receiver assumes that he is fulfilling his own interests and desires. The factors which favour indirect suggestion are mainly interests and habits. Whatever falls in line with our interests and habits is readily accepted. Strong emotions by inhibiting thinking favour indirect suggestion.

Positive suggestions induce one to act at once, 'If you have to buy, buy now'. Negative suggestions induce one to avoid some action or thought. Campaigns against epidemics, public insanitation or road accidents are of this kind. Both positive and negative suggestions are used by advertisers, public speakers and salesmen.

Almost everything said or written carries overtones of suggestion. Merely to say something is to suggest that it is worth saying. Newspapers suggest how important news is by giving it more space, stressing that only two people are honest in the class is to suggest that others are not. When the salesman says 'I was sure you would not like this' he suggests that you are a man of such discriminating taste that you would like a much better thing which he later succeeds in selling to you.

We usually speak of three classes of suggestion: ideomotor suggestion, prestige suggestion and auto-suggestion. Ideomotor suggestion is what we call empathy as for example a spectator watching a high jump lifts his leg when the jumper takes the jump. In this case the suggestion works unconsciously. Prestige suggestion is a matter of common experience. Advice given by great names whom we hold in esteem, certificates of leaders given to products of a certain company, film-stars' photos published alongside advertisements of soaps and face creams and the like are prestige suggestions. Personages who strike awe, respect, admiration and submission among their listeners are able to make effective suggestions by virtue of their prestige. Socially the way in which an individual responds to suggestion is important and

prestige and its effects must be considered when we are doing propaganda for institutions and ideas.

In auto-suggestion the suggestion comes from within Popularized by Coue it means an unreasoned and uncritical acceptance of one's own ideas. Some people have the habit of talking to themselves and secure very much the same results as if the suggestion came from outside. During illness friends make comments and these arouse certain habits so that we by auto-suggestion take a flight into illness. The opinion one has formed of himself, the values he cherishes and the ideal toward which he strives, are examples of auto-suggestion.

Suggestion plays a powerful role in social life and interaction, and is an important way of modifying and controlling social behaviour. What the majority of people around us say and believe, what leaders of the local community and the country say and believe, the large striking headlines in newspapers, the statements of experts, the films we see and the books we read, in fact our entire physical and psychological environment and the social stage on which we live and move are for ever making suggestions and thereby influencing our thoughts, beliefs and behaviour. Suggestion is an important means of social control and social change

Suggestion underlies all processes of socialization The training of children in the home and the school, their initiation into adult ways, their gradual acceptance of social customs, traditions, mores and values, development of their ideas and attitudes toward themselves, role-playing and the like are made possible through a large-scale use of suggestion Successful teachers, preachers, parents, leaders, salesmen, and advertisers are those who make skilful use of suggestion in very subtle ways so that people feel self-motivated even while acting on their suggestions. Eminent leaders like Nehru and Churchill used suggestion to mobilize national energies for highly constructive goals.



Sympathy

Sympathy is feeling with others, experiencing any emotion which is being experienced by a fellow-being Emotions are notoriously infectious and seeing other people grief-stricken or in panic we are inclined to share their grief or fear The distinction

between sympathy, on the one hand, and imitation and suggestion, on the other, is that while imitation and suggestion can be induced sympathy is a natural spontaneous process which cannot be induced from outside. On rare occasions one may feel some emotion while imitating the behaviour of others or under suggestion from others. Sympathetic appeals to influence other people's emotions and thereafter their actions are very common. In fact, Hitler, Nehru, Gandhi and other great leaders could arouse popular emotions with telling effect. During communal riots leaders fanned the fire of communal frenzy by saying, 'What if you had a child, an aged mother or a young wife who was starved, killed, outraged or raped?' and the like. Sympathy is identification of oneself with another person or situation and is more powerful if individuals belong to the same group, creed or nation.

McDougall calls sympathy instinctive but we do not become angry on seeing an angry man or does every one in a crowd falls prey to panic. Allport holds that a person must have experienced certain emotions before he is able to feel sympathy with those having those emotions. And he must also understand the nature of the situations of other persons. This experience and knowledge are essential to sympathy.

That sympathy helps to bring us closer cannot be denied. It is a great force for cohesiveness in society, for when we understand the feelings and motives of others we are able to work with them better.

Strong sympathy in which an individual identifies himself with his family, community or nation, may breed intolerance or indifference for members of other families, communities or nations. An antidote to such parochial sympathy is universalism of the type Gandhi preached and practised. It is extending the field of sympathy to cover the whole of humanity.

Socialization

"Socialization" means the adoption and learning by individuals of values, beliefs and attitudes that are shared by a group. When socialization is effective the individual himself wants to behave as others want and expect him to behave as a responsible group member. Strictly speaking, it always occurrs when a new entrant to a group must adjust to the standards or norms of behaviour

obtaining in that group. The army recruit is socialized when he starts living and behaving like other soldiers and so is the new arrival at the home for the aged when he or she submits to the pressures of the group and accepts their ways of behaving and doing things.

But in social psychology the term is used for social factors in *child development. This is not incompatible with the general* definition of socialization, since the child is learning how to become an accepted member of a group. Socialization is a process of social growth through social functioning. The individual, a biological organism to begin with, through social interaction and social learning comes to acquire and adopt patterns of behaviour prevalent in adult society to which he belongs, and is accepted as a member of the adult community Every culture has its own conventional ways of gratifying biological needs, of responding to and behaving toward other members of the group, of meeting social situations, of communicating with others through language spoken and written, of expressing feelings and emotions, of progressive improvement of conduct, and the like Unless the individual conforms to such conventions he cannot play an effective part in the life of th group. In this sense socialization may be described as the gradual and progressive learning and acquisition by the individual of those ideas, habits, needs, attitudes, etc. as are tolerated and approved by society in which he is born and brought up. Character is the deepest and most lasting result of this process, and it implies consistency in behaviour making for reliability in social living.

The infant is born into the world equipped with certain basic, biologically determined drives such as hunger and thirst, with certain capacities to be stimulated by touch, light, sound, and with *certain capacities to respond, mostly in a random manner* Gradually this undifferentiated organism becomes a *human child* and then a human adult through learning Learning *takes place* through systematic associations of different stimuli one with another and through selective reinforcement of *certain responses* by rewards and punishments.

Obviously the process of socialization is not a *simple process* Many types of influences contribute to it, and the processes we have discussed in chapters four, five and six are the
zation All that is left to be done is to *indicate the*

important agencies in this process.

Of all the forces in the process of socialization, the family, or whoever brings up the child, is most effective in moulding and developing his behaviour. Parents, particularly the mother, teach him to meet the demands of the world in matters of cleanliness, eating and dressing, speaking and behaving, expressing his feelings. The home training and discipline lays the foundation of his moral and social growth, and he learns the primary lessons of sharing things with others, co-operating with them, treating them with consideration, postponing the gratification of his desires.

The process is further carried by play groups, neighbours, the school and the street. Direct and frank criticism of his conduct and achievement gives him a knowledge about himself and paves the way for a realistic approach to the world. He learns to give and take, to discover his abilities and weak point, to adjust himself to a large variety of people, young and old. His knowledge of the world grows, his command of language improves and he is progressively initiated into the social heritage. The school and the college together with the press, the radio, the cinema, social experiences in several areas of life and work, contact with great men and thoughts, books, friends and relations, all subject him to the culture of his group, community and race, and make a man of him. Social interaction and learning make a biological organism human, social and moral. Conformity makes him resemble his fellowmen, but since the interaction between his biological constitution and social environment is seldom identical differences in socialization arise. Man's uniqueness is due to such differences in heredity, environment, and social interaction.

Thus socialization, the social learning process by which the infant becomes "humanized" and humanized in a particular way, is ultimately a case of "people making people out of people" and depends on an interaction of biological and social factors in our environment.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

SARGENT, S. S. and WILLIAMSON, R. C. *Social Psychology* (New York: The Ronald Press Company).

McDOUGALL, W. *Introduction to Social Psychology* (London: Methuen).

KLINEBERG, O. *Social Psychology* (New York: Henry Holt & Co.).

GINSBERG, M. *The Psychology of Society* (London: Methuen).

ALLPORT, F. H. *Social Psychology* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin).

BIRD, C. *Social Psychology* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co.).

CHAPTER VII

PERSONALITY AND CULTURE

So FAR WE have been describing the generalities of social behaviour, how human beings interact with, and learn from, others. We now turn to the individual as a whole, to consider his specific nature It is the study of personality. For social psychology the study of personality is as important and central a subject as that of social behaviour and interaction for it is not merely on social situations but also on the nature and patterns of personalities that social behaviour and interplay between individuals depend. Personality is not available to us readymade at birth It is not something with which we start life It is the product of a long process of development. It is what an individual becomes and achieves in life Individuals differ from each other and the same individual behaves differently at different times. But in spite of such variations there is a strain of unity and uniformity running through the behaviour of each individual This unity and continuity in the behaviour pattern of individuals is a mark of personality and helps us to predict to some extent how an individual may behave in any given situation The study of personality will help us to understand ourselves and our fellowmen, and knowing the personality patterns of the members of a group it may be possible for us to gauge to some extent the pattern of group behaviour Not everyone is able to achieve high degree of unity, continuity and stability in his or her personality. In fact some pass through life in a very haphazard manner without any system or method in their behaviour But most people arrive at a fairly stable and persistent organization of behaviour to enable us to predict how they will conduct themselves in any given situation An insight into their personalities will help us to understand, control and change group behaviour to some extent.

development: its pattern is determined by social interaction and learning, it has both individual and social motives, it has characteristics common with other individuals but their integration and organization is unique in the case of each individual.

Personality and character

The term character implies a judgement of value and we never use it without describing it as 'good' or 'bad', pure or impure, strong or weak. It is essentially an ethical term. On the other hand personality is strictly a psychological term as we have seen in the last section. Some psychologists would say that character is the moral aspect of personality or it is personality judged or evaluated. Character implies a virtuous disposition, but personality is neither good nor bad. It is just what an individual is.

Types of personality

Attempts have been made to classify people into personality types. According to E. Kretschmer there are four main types—the *pyknic*, short round type; the *leptosome*, tall, short trunk, long arms and legs; the *athletic*, muscular type of body, and the *dysplastic*, with some marked abnormality of physical development. Obviously Kretschmer based his classification on body types but labelling people into distinct types tends to emphasize the extremes and to overlook the fact that most people are a mixed type. More recently Sheldon and others tried to classify personality on what they call components of body-build: *endomorphy* or fatness, *mesomorphy* or muscularity, and *ectomorphy* or long and thin body-build. People can be rated on a seven-point scale showing degree of each characteristic. 7-3-1 means extreme endomorphy and 3-3-3 means average in all. This system of rating is 'somatotyping'.

The best known psychological typing is that offered by C. J. Jung who divided people into dreamers and good mixers, the *introverts* and the *extroverts*. The former is guided essentially by inner and subjective thoughts and feelings, and the latter by outer and objective events and situations. Jung recognized that there are no extreme types and the same individual may be an extrovert at one time and introvert at another.

Spranger classified people according to the values they cherish

in life. Those who prize knowledge and truth like philosophers, scientists, teachers or explorers belong to the *cognitive* type. Those who value beauty like artists belong to the *aesthetic* type. Some people are always cutting costs and making economies like businessmen and they belong to the *economic* type. People like statesmen interested in wielding power are of the *political* type. Saints, priests or mystics interested in things spiritual and in relating the present world to the future belong to the *religious* type. Those interested in social movements and reform belong to the *social* type.

The game of classifying people may be fascinating but it has little scientific value because it is based on speculation, it is not exhaustive and leaves a large part of the population unclassified, and a good many people can be fitted into more than one type. The concept of type, in fact, is very wide and crude, and there is not enough evidence to warrant it in any scientific study of the subject.

Personality traits

Psychologists prefer to describe personality rather than classify it. According to some of them personality is made up of specific traits and they attempt to analyse observable behaviour to list traits in a personality. A trait is spoken of as an inner determining tendency that leads to consistency in behaviour or we may describe it in terms of similarities actually observed in outward behaviour. It is an aspect, facet or dimension of personality and helps us in measuring personality For example the trait of dominance-submission is a trait which a person may show in any degree. It is conceived quantitatively, as a continuance scale of measurement from the most agressive dominance to the most abject submission. Few people are purely aggressive and dominant as few people are purely submissive Most lie in-between, and give evidence of the presence of this trait in varying degrees. Other examples of traits are intelligence, emotionality, sociability, and vivacity

The greatest difficulty in this trait theory of personality is the determination of the number of traits Not every word describing human behaviour is a trait There are several thousand words in English which describe human behaviour, but certainly all of them are not traits. A trait must describe the consistent

behaviour of an individual. Punctuality is not a trait till an individual is consistently punctual, and there are no fluctuations or deviations. Secondly, for purposes of measurement it should be present in that individual in the same degree on all occasions. There are some characteristics which are not present in all persons, they are present in some and absent in others, as for example, communism, plagiarism, fault-finding or fast-driving. Again there are characteristics which are found together or which vary together. A cheerful person is friendly, social, hospitable, co-operative, helpful and the like, and the opposites of these qualities are also found together. Through statistical studies intercorrelations among characteristics are obtained and the number of characteristics is reduced to group factors. Many writers have attempted to make lists of the common traits of human personality and Cattell's list of 12 primary traits is the most plausible one. But there is a danger that unity and uniqueness may be lost in such an analysis of personality.

According to F. H. Allport the following are the principal dimensions of personality:

1. Abilities, including intelligence.
2. Motility.
3. Temperament.
4. Self-expression.
5. Sociality.

An individual's *capacity* means what he can do by virtue of his natural endowment, and when he uses that capacity we attribute to him *ability* for what he does. Capacity sets the limit to one's ability and ability is the expression of capacity. It may be knowledge or skill observable in present performance. Aptitude is potential ability to learn readily and profit from training with respect to some specific skill or task. If a child is able to reproduce music, shows interest in singing and playing some musical instrument, we say that he has an aptitude for music. Aptitude testing involves testing present interests and past performances as given in a student's record.

Abilities are classified into intellectual and motor, that is, *intelligence* and *motility*. The term intelligence implies a number of abilities and has been variously defined as the ability to solve

problems, to meet new situations successfully, to make suitable adjustments to environment, to integrate experiences, to remember, to reason and argue, to use number concepts. Terman says, 'An individual is intelligent in proportion as he is able to carry on abstract thinking.' Stern considered intelligence as 'a general adaptability to new problems and conditions of life'. Many define it as the general ability to learn or mental alertness. It is a composite function of the mind and is innate.

The ability to act intelligently is one of the most important, if not the most important, single psychological contribution to personality development. It provides a person with means of recognition and helps him to develop areas of competence with which are connected feelings of worth, self-esteem.

Motility means the quickness with which an individual responds to situations, his speed and skill in doing things and co-ordinating movements, the vigour and steadiness of his responses. It is obvious that these aspects of personality are socially very important. Not only does a person with greater motility impress others but he has a great social stimulus value in so far as he rouses others to greater activity and alertness. In personality ratings during vocational selection this trait is greatly valued.

Temperament refers to the emotional dispositions of an individual, the characteristic feelings, moods and desires of an individual, *the frequency with which they change and the duration* for which they endure Some people get easily irritated and as easily soothed Others nurse *their anger* and *maintain a constant* emotional pitch of feeling Some have strong emotions others are less sensitive Some people are always cheerful, gloomy or shy, in others such feelings are for ever fluctuating. Temperament is an important aspect of personality, for it very largely determines a person's social acceptance Cheerful persons are welcomed and gloomy are shunned

Self-expression refers to the degree to which people express their thoughts, feelings and desires Some are too ready to give expression to their dominant interests, ambitions and desires, and then pursue them with all the vehemence, persistence and effort they are capable of. Others restrain themselves, think more and and act less, hesitate to launch their schemes Many people think at a higher level, have noble and sublime thoughts, and are convinced about the urgent need of translating them into action,

but only a few of them dedicate themselves to a cause and go all out to realize their ideal. The lives of Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Nehru, Swami Dayanand and others are glorious examples of drive and persistence in the service of the causes they cherished. Others are discouraged by obstacles and seek to rationalize or compensate for their lack of drive and effort. We have already dealt with types of such maladjustments.

The distinction between introversion and extroversion to some extent indicates the degree of self-expression in an individual. An introvert has an inner life of thoughts, imagination and dreams and reveals in values, ideals and plans. He likes to be alone and is reserved. The extrovert turns outward, likes to act and do things, and is interested in other people around him. He wears his heart on his sleeve and is never inhibited in giving expression to his thoughts and feelings. A mixture of two is healthy for both self-analysis and social adjustment.

Sociality is another important dimension of personality. In fact this aspect of personality always dominates when people discuss personality, and refers to an individual's sensitivity to social influences, to praise or blame, approval or disapproval of their behaviour by other people. Some people are indifferent to it, others seek it and their success and happiness depends on such social approval or praise. Obviously there are degrees of sociality and they determine how far a person will conform to social norms and ways. It is this characteristic of sociality which makes possible an individual's gradual socialization, his acceptance in adult society.

The main effort today in the scientific study of personality is to describe and measure some of its characteristics and traits, and validate their usefulness in predicting and controlling, behaviour. Many methods like personality inventories, projective techniques and interview assessment are used, but none of them gives a complete picture of personality though each helps a better understanding of this complicated subject. The principal difficulty in this approach to personality through traits is to find meaningful traits and determine how many we need. There are scales to measure them but psychologists are not agreed as to the number of basic traits, and many of them have begun to feel that personality is much more than traits and that its integration is of crucial importance.

Freud's theory of personality

Freud has made a remarkable contribution to our knowledge and understanding of personality structure and has [illegible] tionized clinical and social psychology, and a number of [illegible] fields. While some of his concepts are disputed his general [illegible] on psychology and social sciences is recognized [illegible] all. He has made us look at human behaviour [illegible] new manner.

According to Freud personality is the result of [illegible] cesses or a structure of three parts; the *Id*, the [illegible] *Superego*. The Id is a storehouse of instinctive [illegible] and mainly *sexual*. *It is* the main reservoir of [illegible] instincts, it is primordial nature, the origin and [illegible] biological powers, the source of all energy. The [illegible] completely by the pleasure-pain principle and [illegible] satisfaction of all desires in utter disregard of [illegible] and realities of life. It is entirely impulsive and [illegible] the proper or improper The *Ego* is self-[illegible] aware of what is going on around him [illegible] environment The ego too works on the [illegible] but behaviour is regulated by the physical [illegible] There is awareness of the consequences of [illegible] attempt is made to strike a balance between [illegible] organism *and* the demands of the physical [illegible] ment. The *Superego* is synonymous with the [illegible] because the feelings of remorse and guilt [illegible] critical self internalizing rewards and [illegible] the restrictions of adult society moral and [illegible] of himself. It may condemn the doings of the [illegible] tries to keep the individual on the [illegible] ideals it has learned. It is largely [illegible] *cultural influences* and therefore [illegible] individual is shaping and moulding [illegible] approach is essentially dynamic and [illegible] to point out and describe the [illegible] behaviour.

The psychological adjustment of the [illegible] well the individual can manage to [illegible] Id and the conflicting demands of the [illegible] proper degree of influence and at the [illegible]

in a reasonable degree of relationship with the physical and social environment.

Freud also puts forward the basic concept of the unconscious. For Freud many of the forces that affect our behaviour work at deeper levels of the personality, and we are not consciously aware of them. As the organism develops, conflicts often occur between the instinctive urges and the social ideals and there is repression of the former. These repressed impulses often express themselves in disguised forms through dreams, and Freud used dreams as a tool for the analysis of personality.

It may seem that Freud's structure of human personality creates three compartments but that is not the intention. They are levels, stages or just concepts to describe three processes making up the structure of personality. Although psychologists generally accept the main ideas of Freudian approach, they do not use his terms. Instead they speak of the biological basis of personality and its physiological motives, conditioning and learning and acquisition of social norms and values.

Some colleagues of Freud parted company with him and instead of giving so much emphasis to sex stressed self-assertion, desire for mastery and aggressiveness as the mainspring of behaviour. But almost all of them agree, even the most modern of the psycho-analysts like Karen Horney, Mullahy and Fromm too stress, that dynamics of personality development turns on interaction, on social learning, socialization, in which the parents impose the standards of the society on the child and he in turn adjusts to these constraints as to when and how he may satisfy his basic biological needs. The pattern of this adjustment process is the development of personality. It is continuous, though the early years are the most crucial. It is unique to each individual and it is interactive depending on the relation of each individual child to his particular parents.

Field theory of personality

The trait theory tries to describe behaviour in terms of characteristics and their organization, motivational theory stresses the role of drives in organizing behaviour and the field theory of C. Lewin stresses the role and importance of environment in determining human personality. We have already underlined how social interaction and learning affects human behaviour and

this theory brings out the role of social environment in developing personality.

One of the definitions of personality given above says that it is the subjective aspect of culture and this theory stresses the role of society and culture in the development of personality. Lewin says that each individual is the centre of a 'life space', 'personal field', 'psychological field' or 'behavioural field' in which his behaviour is determined by the attracting and repelling forces acting on him This field is a reality for each person, that is, each of us acts as though what he perceives and how he perceives it is the 'real world'. This helps us to understand how two persons placed in the same situation of things and people may behave differently They behave differently because they perceive the situation differently. In the morning rush of people to places of work, a tailor may see the cut of suits worn by people, a shoe-shine may observe only their shoes, a barber their hair-cut style, and their behaviour may be determined by what they perceive Personality is organized round the attitudes, beliefs or ideals that the individual gradually learns from his social and cultural environment. How objects, events, and people are perceived determine our responses to them, and the social and cultural climate in which a person is brought up will influence his mental and moral make-up, Freedom in a democracy, regimentation in authoritarian regime, religious toleration, communal fanaticism, aesthetic or commercial atmosphere in the family and the like bear on personality and influence behaviour Thus personality may be conceived as a function of an individual reacting to his socio-cultural environment.

Growth and development of personality

Personality represents the organization of behaviour within the social environment and is the product of a long process of growth and development during which the organism is subjected to a large number and variety of influences One way to study the growth and development of personality is to analyse and describe such influences

To begin with an infant is a mass of protoplasm. During the first few weeks it cries, kicks, throws its arms about, clenches its hands or rolls. While it is very difficult to say when personality begins to develop, it certainly develops out of this mass of

undifferented behaviour. Individual differences among infants are observed early. Some babies are more restless than others, some cry less. Some move more, others lie still. Generally an infant responds to other people after four or five weeks. It may smile at an adult, stop crying when picked up, or respond to a sound. Later it may distinguish between friendly and unfriendly sounds. Babies do not attend to other babies before the age of six months and it may be much later that they offer toys to each other.

In most cultures the importance of early years of life in the development of personality is more or less clearly recognized. 'Just as the sapling is bent the tree is inclined' and its variants are found in many languages. The first five years are the most crucial and psychoanalytical studies have confirmed that the imprint of early years on personality is very enduring. A group of psychologists goes so far as to relate adult behaviour patterns to 'birth traumas' or experiences at birth. Here we can only describe in a general way the influences of home, school, marriage, job and the like.

The influence of the home is exercised during the most formative years of the child, and the family is a powerful agent of social control of the individual's behaviour. Out of the child's dependence on others for his nourishment, protection and care there arise powerful psychological needs such as those of company, affection, acceptance, approval, esteem and status. The family has certain norms of behaviour and expects him to conform to them. The child eager to win their approval submits to their control and tries to meet social expectations. This is the beginning of the organization of his behaviour, the birth of his personality. He identifies himself with his parents and imitates their speech, gait and manners. As he is very eager to win their approval, praise and recognition, and is very suggestible, their beliefs, attitudes, likes and dislikes, enthusiasms and inhibitions are readily acquired by him. His own personal experiences give rise to habits, attitudes, beliefs and sentiments, and they impart some sort of an organization, stability and consistency to his behaviour.

How parents treat the child has an important bearing on his personality. If they are strong and repressive the child may become submissive, develop introvert tendencies and withdraw into a make-believe world of phantasy to satisfy his hunger for

affection and recognition. If his parents are over-indulgent and over-eager to satisfy his every whim and desire, he may develop into a selfish, overbearing, impulsive and conceited person. Rigid discipline may develop nervousness and anxiety among children and laxity of control may lead to waywardness and unsocial behaviour. But his temperament which is inborn may resist the suppression at home and defy overstrict discipline.

The atmosphere of the family, the order in which a child is born—the eldest child or the youngest child, the only child, the only son among a number of daughters or the only daughter among a number of sons, a second son born after several years of the first-born, the family population, the family pattern with just father and mother or with a host of aunts and uncles, all bear on the development of personality. While such situations suggest possibilities much depends on how parents treat their children. Possibly, the only child may not be pampered, and a number of children may be spoiled by over-indulgence.

The *school* brings the child into unfamiliar surroundings and strange companions. Now he has to stand on his own legs, dominating younger or weaker fellows and dominated and bullied by stronger and older ones Large group experiences outside the home may help him to revise and change his ideas, attitudes and beliefs acquired in the home. The school tone and the personality of the teacher also influence his personality.

With the onset of adolescence he reaches the high school or college. The study of literature, science, history, biography and other subjects, larger social contacts with adults and their world, films, newspapers, games, debates and the like, participation in responsible tasks and the resulting recognition and approval, all contribute to his intellectual and social development and help him to set realistic goals for his own life. His self-consciousness grows into more constructive channels and he sees himself playing more important and realistic roles in life. Now he is more self-reliant both in thought and action and is anxious to find a place for himself in society. With his employment and economic independence his outlook undergoes a radical change He may breathe greater self-confidence but he certainly looks at his social environment from a new angle His new responsibilities make him reconstruct his ideas and beliefs both about himself and his world. His sense of responsibility is further heightened

and enlarged by marriage. It demands mutual adjustment and close co-operation in the business of running a home and making a happy and peaceful life. The role of a husband, a wife or a parent adds a new dimension to his personality and he is now in the thick of the battle of social living.

Thus from the time of his birth until the time of his death the individual passes through a large variety of social situations and the demands progressively made by them expect him to be both independent and obedient, to assert himself and to bow to higher authority, to serve his self-interest and to make sacrifices for group welfare, to give and to receive love and affection, to achieve financial success and to give away in charity. The great drama of life in which he is called upon to play a large variety of roles with varying success make him what he is. His personality emerges from his progressive interaction with his social environment which is perceived by him in terms of people and the roles they play in society.

What is culture?

Before we discuss how culture influences personality let us try to understand what culture means. The term 'culture' has been used in various meanings. People commonly define culture as 'good manners and good taste' as education and refinement. Social scientists use the term in a more specific and more inclusive sense. It is that complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, art, morals, law, customs, techniques, ideas and values which man acquires as a member of society, which are passed on from one generation to another and under whose guidance he carries out his life-processes. Lindgren defines it "as the over-riding system of values, beliefs, norms, artifacts, and symbols that have been deve oped by a society and are shared by its members". It is essentially way of life of a people. E. E. Jones and H. B. Gerard define it as "a system of shared beliefs, values, symbols, and performance styles that characterize a group". It is, in effect, the residue of past efforts of a group to solve its problems of survival and growth. A particular generation within a society faces a physical and social environment that has been shaped by their earlier generations in their attempt to cope with life's problems. The physical environment remains more or less the same and the clothes we wear and the food we eat, how we warm ourselves in

winter and keep ourselves cool in summer, now we treat ourselves in illness and arrange marriages, and hundreds of other things are devices to meet changes in environment and life and they are a part of our legacy from the past. Linton describes culture as "the precipitate of the history of a given society", its tangible and intangible products, including its rituals, practices, language, values, ideology and norms. It is our social heritage and includes institutions like state, church, community and family, modes and customs of all sorts and ideas of right and wrong techniques of food production and use, arts, crafts and modes of recreation, ways of thinking and living, and modes of communication Each society is distinguished from others by the ways of doing things which are peculiar to that society Culture includes all of man's power and technique of control over nature and himself. His culture dictates what he will be aware of, how he will respond to it, and what he can and must do with his organic needs and functions.

Where environments are relatively stable, cultures may persist over long periods of time with relatively little change. In secluded tribes and communities where, over a long period of time, there have been no invasions, outer contacts and influences, people have worked out a unified culture with clearly laid down beliefs, sanctions and patterns of behaviour, and every individual finds the way of life prepared for him, he has to achieve his life within the restrictions and permission laid down and he can fulfil his responsibility within them.

These environments keep changing by the influx of new values, beliefs and systems of thought, the culture undergoes changes to adapt itself to new realities for that is the only way for society to survive. Indian culture has had a checquered history, it has been absorbing the cultural influences of aliens like Muslims and Europeans. Changes in culture are also produced by the members themselves. Our customs and standards of behaviour are strengthened when members of society conform but they are weakened when a large number of them develop other patterns of behaviour, as is happening today in India

Cultures make for stability in social life and it is possible to predict how a member of a cultural group will think and behave in a given situation.

A distinction is often made between the material and non-material elements or aspects of culture. The whole of man's material civilization, tools, craft, industry, weapons, clothing, means of transport, and other physical objects man has produced for his use constitute the material aspect of culture. On the other hand art, religion, moral codes, literature, political ideas, institutions and systems are a part of the spiritual heritage of non-material culture. But the two elements or aspects are not independent or separate. They interact, depend on each other and develop together. The material elements like tools, equipment or physical inventions can be more easily and readily transmitted across the border to other cultural groups than are customs, beliefs, social conventions and other aspects of non-material culture. Thus each cultural group or culture is unique, has its own peculiar history and can be identified. How often in a foreign land we spot our own countrymen not only from facial expressions but also from their accent and ways of acting and thinking.

It is an essential characteristic of culture that it is passed on from one generation to another. It is transmitted by teaching and learning, both formal and informal. But it is not static and changes in the very process of transmission. These changes are slow and gradual, but they are constant. However, certain basic features of the cultural pattern persist for a considerable time. In conservative societies like those of Hindus, Tibetans and Afghans a number of basic elements of their culture have survived numerous changes in history.

We are not generally aware that we live in a culture as a fish is not aware that it is in water. We become conscious of the peculiarities of our culture only when we come in contact with people of different culture. Orthodox Hindus are shocked to see Western people in their uninhibited ways of living and dressing. Usually common people attribute such differences to heredity, climate or geographical conditions, but they are due to social heredity and culture.

Culture and society

By society or social system we mean the total structure and functioning of an organized group of people. Such a definition would apply to many kinds of groups like communities, work organizations or castes or major sections of them, society here means larger group like Indians, British people or the Tibetans.

Now culture consists of the products [illegible] of a given society. Society and culture are closely allied phenomena. Culture is a way of life, of thinking and behaving, and a way of life is always a characteristic of a people living together in some sort of a system Culture does not exist apart from society, by itself, and every collectivity of people sooner or later does develop some sort of a culture. Society is composed of people and the way they live is their culture.

Each individual is born into a society which, as a social system, is an embodiment of a given culture Culture is his social heritage. There are animals like ants, bees and even some quadrupeds which herd together into a systematic group We may attribute social behaviour to them but they have no culture It is man alone who is capable of cultural behaviour and this cultural behaviour is socially acquired.

Different social systems may have one common underlying culture West European countries of England, France, Russia and Germany have a common cultural heritage Conversely a given society may inherit from a combination of several cultures, either well integrated or in conflict with each other as for example, the social systems of America and Mexico

Both society and culture are studied in social psychology because they influence the behaviour of the individual and contribute to shape his personality, through processes of socialization The individual, in turn, perpetuates the social system and its culture by transmitting them to the next generation

Personality and culture

Personality varies with the kind of culture in which it develops. The cultural and social environment in which an individual is brought up exercises a powerful influence on personality traits. Broadly speaking, an American is different from a Hindu as is a Chinese from an Arab Primitive people are different from civilized people, an orthodox Hindu is different from the one who returns to India after ten years' stay in the West, an Englishman who has spent most part of his life in Hong Kong will be different from one who has lived mostly in London. Such differences are due to the cultural backgrounds which have affected their ways of doing and behaving, their personality traits "That individuals living in societies with cultures different from our own show quite distinctive personality characteris-

ties is evasion is often slight acquaintance with persons from other societies."*

Earlier personality has been described as 'the subjective aspect of culture'. In every society there is a 'basic personality type' or a 'basic personality structure' consisting of certain personality characteristics which are in harmony with the type of institutions provided in that culture. These characteristics the individual has in common with his fellows, and they distinguish him and his fellows from the members of a different culture. This, however, does not rule out individual differences but refers to these attitudes and beliefs which result from the cultural influences of any social structure and which are common to a large majority of people of that group or society. Culture allows and makes for individual differences but there are similarities too which mark off individuals of one group from those of others. These imply the peculiar imprint of culture on personality. There are certain personal habits, traits, attitudes or beliefs which every individual acquires in the course of his own experience with his environment, and these provide individual differences.

Just as culture is a growing changing phenomenon so also basic personality characteristics grow and change. Indian culture has passed through several phases in history involving corresponding changes in basic personality characteristics. Broadly speaking Muslim and British influences on Indian culture were reflected in the personality pattern of an Indian in those periods.

Anthropologists have always been interested in the customs, institutions, and behaviour of primitive peoples, but recently they have dealt with personality differences. M. Mead's studies of the inhabitants of Samoa and New Guinea are now very well known. Samoans lived in large families, their attitude to sex was very liberal, there were very few taboos and inhibitions, and they were very well adjusted. Adolescence among them was not a period of stress and strain. On the other hand the Manus of New Guinea are very aggressive and self-assertive, they are more industrious and physically stronger, and they have greater respect for authority. Sex is surrounded by taboos and is repressed. Naturally, therefore, adolescence is a difficult period of great strain.

* K. Young, *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.), p. 136.

In another study Mead investigated cultural differences in sex roles. No characteristic of a person is more immediately and clearly perceived than sex and all societies assign more or less distinctive roles to men and women. That such roles make a difference to the personality of men and women is quite obvious. Among Hindus and Muslims women are submissive, responsive and co-operative; the traits prized most among them are obedience, loyalty, devotion, service and self-effacement. Among Americans women are less inhibited, more independent and aggressive, dominating and assertive. Mead studied three primitive groups of the New Guinea island, viz. the Arapesh, the Mundugumor and the Tchambuli

The Arapesh make no distinction between men and women Both are considered equally human and both have the same object in life to grow children and food. Both take a motherly interest in their children, are gentle, co-operative and unaggressive. Both may take positions of leadership just for the sake of sharing labour and responsibility. But their personality characteristics are individual ones

The Tchambuli people have clearly defined roles for men and women. Men are mostly concerned about ceremonial activities They are artists skilled in painting, carving, plaiting, dancing and the like. Their chief role is on the stage and they are busy making masks and costumes They are the centre of social appreciation and recognition But women had the real power, for they controlled economic affairs like trade, fishing, gardening or food supply. They looked after the household and brought up children. Men cannot spend without the permission of women In love women took the initiative and appreciated the performance of men in games and arts Men kept to themselves and were sly and quarrelsome

The Mundugumor people were rough and violent, and admired violence, aggressiveness, and physical power in others. They were very strict with their children and brought them up very roughly. This pattern and ideal of life was the same for both men and women. Meekness, gentleness or softness were looked down upon, and competition, jealousy, revengefulness, fighting, violence and lust were highly prized in both the sexes.

Thus in three tribes living in the same island and having the

same ge[illegible] and racial heredity, different personality characteristics were appreciated and developed because of the distinctive cultural tradition and climate.

Individual differences in personality are partly due to heredity, neuro-muscular and glandular make-up, and partly due to maturation, nutrition, sex, age. Each individual grows and develops according to his own biological pattern but the content and direction of this growth is provided by culture as he interacts with it. Culture is often described as social heredity made up of traditions, customs, mores, institutions, beliefs, arts and sciences, luxuries and necessities provided by industrial plants. This is common to all members of the society and provides common experiences for all of them, thus giving rise to common characteristics of a basic personality. A general personality type is found in different culture patterns and reference has already been made to 'basic personality'. This concept was proposed by Abram Kardiner and Ralph Linton in 1937 and has been found useful.

These two authors also emphasized that cultural influences are exerted through ways and methods of child upbringing and training in the home and the school. Though Freudians were the first to lay great stress on the value and importance of early childhood experiences on the subsequent growth and development of adult personality there is general agreement that early training is very significant. If the pattern of cultural training is similar there is similarity in personality structure also. What care and affection mothers are able to give their children, what affectionate relations obtain between parents and children and between parents themselves, the nature of discipline to which children are subjected in the home and the school—it may be too strict or too lax, and what relations are found among brothers and sisters, these and the like influence children's attitudes and their social development.

Parents in India are very much child-minded. The mother in India feeds her child at her breasts much longer than does a Western mother. Children are generally accepted and welcomed. There is little systematic toilet training and children are not punished for toilet irregularities. Children are not left alone for long and are mostly carried by one member of the family or the other. In the early years infants learn mostly by imitation

and their training is not forced. This [illegible] contrast to child upbringing in the West where infants are put on the bottle early, are left alone for most part of the day, sleep in a separate crib, or start receiving training in toilet, sitting, standing or walking very early, where parents are too busy with their own life outside the home. Psychoanalysts hold that much of widespread neurosis in the West may be due to forced weaning and training in early years.

Many psychiatrists and psychoanalysts have studied the relation of culture and personality from their own angle. Karen Horney held that neurosis is rooted in the cultural pattern, in the contradictions in the demands and the values of our culture. She mentions three types of contradictions: (1) between competition and success on the one hand, and brotherly love on the other, (2) between stimulation of our needs and our frustrations in satisfying them, and (3) between alleged freedom of the individual and his numerous limitations All these factors result psychologically in the individual's feeling that he is isolated and helpless. Such contradictions in American life today breed neurosis. Conflicts are readymade by the American way of life and these culturally determined conflicts when experienced in intensity lead to neurotic trends in basic personality.

Let us study some examples of personality structure from primitive tribes as also from modern nations

Personality in some primitive cultures

The Hopi are an American Indian group living in northern Arizona. The climate of the region is mild, vegetation scanty and the number of the tribe less than four thousand Their chief occupation is farming and hunting They are divided into clans and exercise social control through gossip and ridicule Women are the centre of the household and all the property is vested in them. Land is passed on from mother to daughter and the position of women is quite high and dominant There is no trace of aggressiveness and prestige-seeking in their social life, and the economic system is co-operative. Personal striving is regarded as abnormal and due to witchcraft, and is socially disapproved. Hopi children find greater pleasure in meeting social demands of co-operation than in personal achievement Although they are found quite intelligent on the performance scale due to

tribal tradition is often afraid of supernatural powers. They become angry at aggression and do not like any tendency to stand out separate from the group. Hopi personality is markedly co-operative. Though there is much indulgence in early life the strong help the weak and social dependence is emphasized. Pride and selfish wishes are not permitted, any expression of self-assertion is absent. Personal ambition has no place and group goals motivate life and behaviour. The severest punishment is denial of social support and participation. An Hopi is a quiet and passive person completely socialized. According to modern thinking it may be said that his ego or self is suppressed. There is great stress on shame and the fear of shame is the basis of social security. Children are hurried from childhood to adulthood and there are no problems of adolescence. There is greater freedom in sex.

In sharp contrast to the Hopi the Kwakiutl of the Pacific Northwest coast have a highly developed system of social ranking. There are high nobles consisting of the first born of the families of high rank. The younger people like others belong to the lower rank. There is another class of slaves. The region is rich and there are reserved places for fishing and hunting. The chief provides for the needy. Every member of the tribe is obsessed with the ideas of rank and strives for prestige. In fact rank and prestige are considered more important than property. There are various titles and crests given to individuals on the basis of family background and status. People compete at giving gifts to rivals and arranging more costly feasts.

There is great rivalry and hostility between the younger sons and the eldest who is privileged. Marriage is also a contest for prestige. In marketing too there is a great deal of boasting and competition. Religious life too reflects their great drive for prestige and their stress on rank.

Child training is very strict and fits into their rank system. Children are often dipped into cold water to toughen them. Names are given to a child every year and gifts are distributed to members of the tribe till he achieves adulthood. Rivalry and competition at interpersonal level is high. Property is a symbol of great prestige and though shame is a great mechanism of social control competition pushes a child into adulthood and the struggle for rank pushes an aged person into a backwater. There

is little stress on co-operation or gro[illegible] here ar[illegible] even ceremonies are held against a background of struggle for rank and prestige. Religion involves a belief in the graded ranks of spirits which man tries to control for his own advantage.

Numerous anthropologists all over the world have made detailed investigations into the pattern of life and culture of primitive tribes and clearly brought out the influence of culture on personality, and it is for want of space that more examples of such studies are not cited here.

Personality in some modern cultures

Due to rapid means of communication and transport, and because of widespread desire to know and understand other types of people, there is a great commingling of people and cultures today. But even then slight shifts of cultural patterns bring in their wake differences in personality structures as we shall see hereinafter But one caution is necessary Literature and newspapers invest people from other lands with characteristics which have no scientific basis and which are just prejudices Not seldom national and political ties blind us to reality and friendly nations are favourably described Again such descriptions are often based on impressions of travellers, journalists and the like

Another very popular concept used to describe basic personality characteristics found in any nation or similar group is '*national character*' *But the term character is used in so many* ways that discriminating writers use the term 'national characteristics' in its place. Again due to large-scale international mixing an Indian educated in England or America may resemble people of those countries more than he does an Indian farmer for example But these facts do not negate the truth that a nation does have certain characteristics whatever may be the level of her development Let us take a few illustrations

The Japanese believe that their emperor is descended from the sun goddess and worship him with great reverence, loyalty, devotion, and obedience They have a very high sense of duty and discipline supported by an equally strong feeling of shame In order to save their face they would make any sacrifice. They have strong national and anti-foreign attitudes, and these spring largely from their great loyalty and devotion to their emperor. They are very patriotic, are devoted to their family, and have

great pride as is often honour, initiative, industry, and a sense of mission. They are quiet and cool. Though they are very indulgent to their children they bring them up very strictly teaching them cleanliness, manners and respect for authority very early in life. Boys are dominant and aggressive, girls are taught to be affectionate and submissive.

After the last World War in which the Japanese were defeated they accepted the consequences of defeat partly because of their great regard for the emperor and partly to avoid shame and humiliation. But under American occupation their culture and personality underwent radical changes. The American influence tempered their rigid approach and made them more democratic and pacificist.

That Americans have certain characteristics peculiar to them may appear doubtful in view of the large size of the country, the large variety of people inhabiting it and the numerous subcultures contributing to its general culture pattern. But there is no denying the fact that it is a dynamic country, that its people have within a short range of time transformed a land of undeveloped resources into a most prosperous and advanced country through sheer diligence, initiative, perseverance and foresight, that they attach the greatest importance to success and achievement, and that they are more concerned with the future than with the past. Their approach is practical and dominant, they enjoy competing and working hard, they have sympathy for the underdog, and are generous and charitable. They love their land, they love themselves and they love life. Democracy, individual freedom, race pride, faith in technology are basic to their personality structure. Their reading material is full of 'success stories'.

A number of sociologists and anthropologists like M. Mead, G. Gorer, R. Williams and others have dwelt at length on the major dimensions of American character. Others with a psychiatric approach have found in American way of life a basis for neurotic trends.

Before we conclude this discussion it may be pointed out that certain personality characteristics are normal in one culture and abnormal in another. Too much thinking is considered normal in India but it may be considered abnormal in America. Withdrawal, meditation and mystical experiences are normal in

India but abnormal in the West [illegible] are certain personality traits which would be thought abnormal everywhere

Measurement of personality

Our illustrations cited above bring out the influence of environment on personality as shown by some out-of-the-way cultures Anthropologists who have studied cultures in detail find that in each culture the 'ideal person' or basic personality is different, that is, each culture uses human possibilities differently. If a human being lived in one culture he would be a co-operative, kindly, peaceful person, non-aggressive and avoiding fighting. In another cultural environment he would be keen to discredit his rivals and make himself important We think that they are such because we observe them behaving in that manner But there are other ways of judging personality and we may describe some of them in addition to what has already been said in the second chapter.

Self-report technique.—A number of psychologists have worked out tests of personality in which an individual reports on such questions as these:

Do you enjoy taking part in an argument with someone?
Do you usually stick to a job till it is finished?
Do you cry when you see a sad film?
Are you afraid of going to the dentist?
Does it worry you if you find your table untidy?

There are many such tests and they illustrate facts and faults about this type of personality investigating Here you yourself report on yourself but not all aspects of the personality are tested. There is a possibility that you may report falsely in order to give yourself a higher rating Or it may be that you do not know or understand yourself accurately enough The validity of such tests is low

Projective techniques.—These techniques are being used widely for personality testing Here material which might be interpreted in a number of different ways is presented to the person for interpretation It is believed that the person tested will project his feelings, desires and values [illegible] upon this material and thus reveal [illegible]

us descri[illegible] is often [illegible]mmon projective techniques.

The Rorschach or *Ink-blot Test* is named after the Swiss psychologist Hermann Rorschach who invented it, though a number of psychologists after him have continued to work and improve these tests. It is made up of a series of ink-blots and the person taking the test is asked to tell the examiner what the ink-blots look like to him. He is encouraged to describe everything that he sees. The examiner records the descriptions verbatim and later scores them according to several categories: *location*—whether responses are based on the whole blot, details or white spaces; *determinants*—whether responses are organized in terms of form, shading, colour, or movement; *content*—whether blots are interpreted as an animal, human figure, or part of a map, etc.; *popularity* or *originality* of the content. The interpretation of these tests requires special training, and the scores are first interpreted separately and then together to know how the personality is organized.

Rorschach tests cover all areas of personality, intelligence, emotions, motivations and aspirations, social needs and skills, sex, conflict and adjustments. A woman may feel hostile toward her husband, and yet be hungry for affection and love. A man may be jittery with his emotions, unable to reason and think out his problems. Rorschach tests bring out conflicts and compromises between wishes and reality, desire and fear, intellect and emotions.

Thematic Apperception Test or *TAT* employs a series of twenty pictures, each to be shown to the person taking the test in order that he may tell a story about the picture and tell what the feelings and thoughts of people in the picture might be. One picture might be of an elderly woman standing at the door, looking out. In the room by a table sits a young woman, head buried in her arms. Now what you would have to say about this picture, it is believed, will reveal your own personality. What thoughts and feelings you attribute to the chief figures of the picture will reflect your own thoughts and feelings in a similar situation.

Picture Arrangement Test or *PAT* employs a number of sets of three pictures, identified by a triangle, a rectangle, and a circle, which the subject arranges in an order which seems to him to tell the most meaningful story. Underneath the pic-

tures are three lines on which the [illegible] the order of the pictures and writes a sentence beside each one. This test has all the advantages of projective techniques that there is freedom of interpretation plus the additional advantage of objective scoring and standardization. One of the great advantages of projective techniques is that they are able to go beneath the surface and reveal patterns of motivation largely unknown to the subjects and to probe unconscious depths of behaviour. But they are very expensive. Their scoring and interpretation require special training and a lot of time, and they can be given to one person at a time.

Results of personality testing must be very cautiously used Personality testing may not yield reliable evidence unless it is collated with other tests and evidence from other sources is also available. The interpretation and evaluation of personality test scores should be done by trained and experienced persons.

Conclusion

For the most part we have treated personality as an organized system of ideas, habits, traits, attitudes and sentiments of an individual. In so far as they are related to conduct affecting other people around us they are organized into roles and status; and when they are organized in respect of the goals, motives, wishes and the like of an individual we speak of the self or one's own mental make-up The first aspect of personality is external dealing with the behaviour or responses expected of an individual by his associates when he is playing roles consistent with his status. The second aspect of personality is internal dealing with the organization of his inner life, the self It is the organizing principle of personality and is involved in our strong desires and purposes, in our frustrations and conflicts. In the next two chapters we shall deal with these two aspects in detail.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

ALLPORT, G. W. *Personality, A Psychological Study* (New York: Henry Holt & Co.).

CATTELL, R. *Personality* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc.).

EYSENCK, H. J. *The Structure of Human Personality* (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd.).

HONIGMANN, J. J. *Culture and Personality* (New York: Harper & Brothers).

YOUNG, K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.).

SARGENT, S. S. and WILLIAMSON, R. C. *Social Psychology* (New York: The Ronald Press Company).

HALE, S. C. and LINDSEY, G. *Theories of Personality* (Wiley).

GINSFORD, J. P. *Personality* (McGraw-Hill).

SARGENT, S. S. and SMITH, H. W. *Culture and Personality* (The Viking Fund).

CHAPTER VIII

SOCIAL NORMS, ROLES AND STATUS

IN EVERY SOCIETY a man wishes to stand well with his fellows, to win their respect and approbation, to have relations with them that will make it possible for him to carry out those activities with which he is concerned. Therefore, he acts in conformity with the customs, traditions, values, and the like prevailing in the society. A Brahmin in an orthodox community must rise early, take his bath and sit down to worship. In large towns people waiting for a bus must stand in a queue and await their turn. In England a 'gentleman' must take off his hat on entering a room, must let ladies enter first, must express regret by saying 'sorry' when he brushes past a stranger, and the like. In some Indian communities Hindu widows shave their heads, in others they only cover their heads The Hopi look down upon all striving for personal power and prestige, and the Kwakiutl commend competition and struggle for status and rank. Thus each cultural group has specific characteristics expressed in customs, traditions, values and the like. They represent their *social norms or standards.* A Hindu is surprised that there are people who eat frogs and beef just as a Red Indian is surprised that among some oriental communities all the work is done by men and women sit behind *purdah.* A man should have only one wife, a woman should have only one husband; people should work only five days in a week; infants should be breast-fed for two years, all are examples of social norms obtaining in any one cultural group.

Social norms

A norm is a standard which prescribes the performance or characteristics of a large group of people against which other individuals can be compared There are, for example, norms of intelligence or infant motor development. Some psycho-

logists draw, is often [illegible] between norms and standards. The word standard, according to them, implies a goal to be achieved or objective to be reached, but a norm is not a measure of what ought to be, but of what actually is. Such a distinction may hold good in psychological measurement, but in social psychology a norm indicates a standard of behaviour as defined by a group, society or culture. The term *social norm* was first introduced by Sherif to denote the accepted customs, rules, traditions, attitudes and values found in every established group. These norms provide frames of reference, which guide the judgements, feelings and actions of members of that group. Thus respect for the aged mother, worshipful regard for the cow, taking breakfast after bath are accepted social norms among Hindus though they are occasionally violated. They regulate behaviour within the group.

Social norms are being constantly built in the course of social interaction in everyday life. For example till recently railway porters in India used to rush to the compartments when any train arrived and snatch luggage from passengers. Now they all stand in a row and instead of rushing about await to be called by passengers of the compartment halting just in front of them. A social norm has been built up and every railway porter is expected to conform to it. Thus a social norm refers to any criterion of experience and behaviour in social interaction which regulates the behaviour of group members. It is a generalization covering behaviour in a number of similar social situations by a number of members.

Social norms involve judgements of value. An act of behaviour is either approved or disapproved according as it conforms or does not conform to a social norm. Thus social norms denote patterns of behaviour expected or demanded of members of a group, how they should or ought to behave, whether they actually behave that way or not. In fact at any time a number of members may not conform to them or the same member may sometimes conform and sometimes ignore them.

Social norms have a high emotional tone. Hindus abstain from beef and condemn those who do not. Sikhs hate smoking, and Muslims prescribe *purdah* for women. These norms have emotional tinge and their violations are strongly resented by members. Even then they are generalizations which now and

then permit exceptions and variations [illegible] girls may not observe *purdah*, old women too may do without it, and lack of *purdah* among highly educated ladies is not objected to.

Social norms are transmitted from one generation to another and in some ancient cultures some of them can be traced to several centuries back. Folding hands to greet people, taking off shoes before entering the kitchen or cleaning one's mouth after meals are very ancient social norms among Hindus though they are changing under the impact of foreign culture That social heritage influences the behaviour of the present generation is too true in India Some social norms are short-lived like fads and fashions but others endure through centuries and are woven into the life of the people *Dhoti* and *kurta* have been replaced by bush-shirt and pant and guests are entertained with tea or coffee instead of milk and curd

It may seem that the effect of social norms is to make society static and uniform so that each generation repeats what the previous generation did But this is not so. In the first place they allow variations and are not rigid. Secondly, some of them are based on universal values which may be interpreted in new constructive ways. In fact our great social reformers in India like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Swami Dayanand and Mahatma Gandhi have helped to change and reconstruct social life in India by interpreting traditional social values in new contexts so that change and reform is rooted in the past for which masses have a great reverence Mahatma Gandhi's political programme of civil disobedience and non-cooperation was based on the ancient social norms of *ahimsa* and truth and was thus made readily acceptable to the masses

Social norm is a very wide term and includes all types of social expectations and demands in the form of customs, traditions, folkways, rules of conduct, etiquette, values and the like. Naturally therefore social norms cannot be rigid, must make allowances for individual variations and latitude in action They do not specify a single course of action but cover a wide range of behaviour which is permitted or tolerated. This is particularly so when the type of behaviour covered by them is less important. In the case of very significant and important matters social norms are less elastic and impose a narrow range of permissive behaviour. Secondly, group norms may be established about

anything [illegible] is often [illegible] real or imagined. In Hinduism for example, there are norms about such *abstract things as Maya or Pralaya* (doomsday). Then there are norms about such concrete things as food, water or making presents to daughters and sisters.

An important thing about group norms is that they enable members to communicate with each other. People can interact without any common body of norms; a mother and an infant can interact but they cannot communicate, that is, share each others meanings unless they have common norms. Communication implies similar experiences and similar meanings of those experiences. This is possible if they share the same frames of reference. Social norms therefore imply standard meanings and not standard behaviour. Group members often behave in very much the same manner; for example, they all enjoy a festival match. they may enjoy it in very much the same manner, their behaviour will have the same standard meaning of enjoyment. but they may also enjoy in slightly different ways. This means that social norms may *lead to different types of behaviour but continue to* have the same standard meaning for all members, that is, all members will understand the common meanings of different kinds of behaviour. Thus mutual understanding is made possible by common standard meanings. Such understanding is not always perfect depending on whether common meanings are precise or vague.

Though social norms tend to change and there is nothing fixed *or absolute about them they are absolutely* necessary for the stability of social structures and the perpetuation of culture. They provide it with relatively fixed and limited standards of judgement by means of which we interact or give meaning to particular events. Without such standards of judgements, which have been called frames of reference, an individual would lose his moorings and would not know what to do in this complex and complicated world. It is not possible for every individual to spend endless *time and energy in thinking everything* out and arrive at some opinion about everything. So most of us accept them uncritically as guide posts till such time they fail us or need revision and change.

Social norms and values of a society are not usually codified though attempts have been made to do so. Manu Smriti is one such attempt, and laws of a state, penal codes, lists of religious

commandments and the like have [redacted] norms. In modern life an individual belongs to several groups which may have different or even conflicting norms. A grown-up person may belong to several social and religious organizations because his family has always done so. He has professional associations, merchants' chambers, bar associations, doctors' clubs, bankmen's union and the like. If he is rich he may belong to a night club where he drinks, dances and lets himself go. He may be manager or president of an educational institution or an informal group of bridge players. Each of these groups has its own social norms. Some of them may be similar, others may conflict. He may be compelled to give up membership of certain groups because of this conflict or he may adjust by behaving differently or even in contradictory ways in different groups.

Some groups are all-pervasive and affect every area and aspect of life and work. A member of the Congress has not only to hold certain definite views on political and social work and change but also to wear *khadi*, to spin and do constructive work in villages, to abstain from smoking and drinking, to work for the uplift of the depressed and suppressed classes and so on. But some groups have a narrow range of work. Porters at a railway station put on red uniforms and stand in a line when a train arrives. The norms of the two groups will accordingly vary in range. Social norms of the former group will affect every important aspect of life while those of the latter will be limited to the time and place of work.

Group may be formally organized or just informally get together. In formal groups social norms are codified into rules and laws. A legislative assembly has written rules and regulations for the conduct of its proceedings. Formal clubs, organized games of cricket and hockey and the like have standardized ways and written rules, but rural assemblies, community meetings or groups of working women have no such formal rules. They just improvize rules of work on the spot. If a group of children are given a rubber ball they devise games and formulate rules for them, and a little later pass on to another game and make rules to manage that. But on that account it cannot be said that they have no group norms. They punish those who violate their unwritten rules by depriving them of play and accord recognition and praise to those who play according to rules. Professiona

conduct a[illegible] is often doctors or lawyers is regulated by social norms though there is no written code of do's and don'ts. If a new entrant to the profession tries his new-fangled methods of approach he is frowned upon and soon falls in line.

Lastly, social norms are in a way social stimulus situations. The individual does not react to the abstract value or ideal implicit in the norm but to its concrete forms. We do not react to 'law' when we stop at the traffic signal; we react to the danger involved in it and to the policeman who bars the way and may pull us up. We shout 'Jai Hind' or salute the flag because others are doing, and not doing it would mark us out in a crowd, but all the time we are learning the abstract value of love of our country. Children salute their teachers because it is done and expected in the school and they are learning the social norm of respect for teachers.

Social norms and individual behaviour

From the very birth every individual is surrounded by and subject to social norms. They are given to him in the learning process in the home by parents and in the school by teachers; art, music, drama, films, means of transport, communication, production and distribution, food habits, dress, etiquette, and numerous other institutions and influences of socialization impress upon him values, standards, and norms of society. They serve to control and regulate the behaviour of an individual in a group. Rules of etiquette, manners, mores, conventions, laws reflect some of the major norms of the group. They bring about regular and recurrent responses in an individual and it is because of such regulations that we can predict an individual's behaviour in any social situation.

To begin with the social norms are external to the individual and he comes to know about them only through the actions and words of other people. But mere knowledge of them is not enough to regulate his behaviour. In the beginning children may not respond to them or even ignore or resent them. But through constant presentation of these norms in social interaction children come to understand their meaning and scope, and learn to adopt them as their own. What they did from external pressure is now done of their own free will. Norms are social stimulus situations and their effects are found in the enduring dispositions, and the

ways in which these dispositions [illegible]. Through learning these social norms are 'internalized', that is, the individual adopts them as his own and learns to conform to them. His implicit habits of thinking and attitudes, as well as his outer mannerisms and skills become organized according to the social norms. A soldier not only learns soldiering, but he learns to think and feel like a soldier. Thus social norms ensure conformity, solidarity, and continuity of a group, community or culture.

But divergence and deviations of behaviour do occur in spite of social norms. There are delinquents and criminals, and there are people highly placed whose conduct does not match up to their professions of morality. In every society there is a gulf between moral ideals or aspirations and actual performance It shows that there are two aspects of adaptation to social norms: how the individual himself interprets or gives a meaning to his own reactions, and how they are considered by others. Professional swindlers and smugglers do not consider their conduct blameworthy, and if caught they produce amazing arguments to defend their conduct.

Formation of social norms

The problem of the formation of social norms may be studied from two angles: how norms arise in a group and how children come to acquire social norms.

It must be clearly recognized that social norms are shared norms. They are the standards or values of the group and arise in connection with matters of importance to the group The conduct, strivings and aspirations of members of the group are regulated by these norms These norms cannot be known or inferred from the behaviour of single individuals They emerge from group or social interaction and can be known from group or social situations. Readers must have realized by now that the behaviour of individuals in group interaction is different from individual behaviour and cannot be explained in terms of the latter, and therefore, we must draw a line between individual psychology and social psychology.

Now what are the characteristics of social situations in which norms arise? Sherif distinguishes between 'structured' and 'unstructured' situations, the former being compelling, strong and clear, and the latter, weak, ambiguous, and vague. It is the

latter type of [illegible] situations that social norms arise because they offer alternatives for experience and behaviour. In structured situations the objective factors are strong and compelling and mostly determine experience and behaviour. Amidst tools, buildings, timetables, things of definite magnitudes, proportions and limits the responses of an individual are more or less accurately determined. He has definite scales and standards to measure size, speed, and the like. But it is in unstructured situations like birth, death, marriage, illness, quarrel, and the like that customs and traditions arise. What we eat and how we eat, how we dress, what ceremonies or rites should regulate marriages in any group, how we treat strangers and intimate friends, how patients should be nursed, and the like are vague indefinite situations which leave room for a number of alternatives for experience and behaviour, and that is why customs, traditions, standards and values have full scope to develop with regard to these matters. The various alternatives are compared and the desirable ones are stabilized or confirmed through processes of social interaction, through past experience, and through established social relations and goals. When social norms arise those situations become structured and definite. The type of experience and behaviour possible at the time of birth or death in an orthodox Hindu home is very precisely determined because of the decisive role of accepted social norms. For poor people in Indian villages there are no social norms with regard to taking tea in the afternoon, but richer people who have separate tea in drawing rooms with crockery, tea trolleys, and a host of other things, have social norms which make almost a ritual of tea-taking.

The second question with regard to the formation of social norms is how children develop and acquire them. Murphy, Murphy and Newcomb* maintain that moral judgements are clearly not simply assimilated readymade from the preceding generation, but are reworked in terms of the child's needs and degrees of identification with and respect for other individuals. Many moral judgements of children are in violent conflict with those of their parents and of the social world in which they live, if a type of behaviour related to their need is involved. Many children protest with tears when dogs or domestic animals are

* *Experimental Social Psychology* (New York: Harper & Brothers).

cruelly beaten by their parents or other [illegible] are moved to pity when they read in fairy stories about the cruel treatment given to wolves or giants. The needs of children are not only biological but also products of social experience.

Many psychologists and educationists have studied the growth and development of moral ideas among children, and they show that to begin with the child is very self-centred and it is only gradually that he comes to acquire altruistic moral ideas. In the early thirties the Swiss psychologist P. Piaget published his studies of the development of ideas of right and wrong among children of the lower class in Geneva. He showed that the moral judgements of the child pass through four stages or levels. In the first stage their just do what people around them do. They played marbles as older boys did and enjoyed doing it without any consideration of right and wrong. This stage is amoral and if they were asked who won the game they replied that everybody won. The second stage was marked by 'moral realism'. The rules of the game must be strictly enforced; what is right is right and what is wrong is wrong. If any person does wrong he must be punished regardless of his motives. If they are told that other boys have different rules, they do not understand it and do not care. Children of the age group 4-5 are of this type. A little later at the age of 7-8 years they enter the third stage and begin to realize that rules are not objective and absolute but are made by people and reflect group values. Through social interaction they recognize that such rules are a matter of mutual arrangement and can be changed and replaced by other rules. In fact they do devise new games and make new rules. Geneva children which Piaget was studying remain at this stage till the age of 9-10. Then around adolescence they reach the fourth stage when they realize that mutual arrangement is not the only criterion of rule making Rules should be altered by considerations of justice and equity If the rule applies to all it is satisfactory, but there may be cases where rigid universal application of the rules may be unfair, for example, a lame or handicapped boy may be given a start in a race, or a sick or new boy may be allowed to have two turns. Piaget's conclusions have been supported by other investigators in the field, but his explanation that early conception of moral rules as rigid and absolute is due to the strict authoritarian discipline of the parents

seems to be too naive. It may be due to lack of proper understanding of the implications of moral rules and tacit acceptance from adult members of the group.

Experiments with norm formation

In 1936 Sherif conducted an experiment to show the formation of social norms and how they influence and overshadow individual norms. His objective was twofold: what will an individual do when he is called upon to judge a stimulus situation without any objective structure and without any relation to the external environment, and how will a group respond to it. He asked individuals seated in a darkened room to observe the movement of a pinpoint of light. The light was actually stationary but it appeared to move in all directions. The subjects all reported some movement. They were unable to localize the light as the whole room was completely dark. When Sherif asked the subjects how far the light had moved, he found, over a series of 100 exposures, that each person tended to settle down to a narrow range of estimates of 3 to 4 or 6 to 7 inches. In other words, each subject quickly developed for himself a characteristic individual norm as the basis of his estimate and expressed all his judgements within that range.

In another part of the same experiment the same subjects were brought together in group of two or three and asked to make estimates of the movement of the light. As the light was presented, each person announced his estimate of its movement and also heard the other members of the group make their estimates. Although members of the group had previously reported widely different estimates when tested individually, now they tended to reduce the differences and made their estimates more or less in conformity to a norm that was characteristic for each group.

Later Sherif reversed the order of the two parts of the experiment for a second group of individuals by testing them first in groups for a series of trials and then testing them individually. He found that the norm which was established in the group situation persisted after the subjects were no longer in the group. The norm which had emerged in social interaction continued to influence the judgement of individuals when they were alone. Thus group norm was adopted by the individual subjects as their own norm.

Sherif's experiments show clearly [illegible] ...ted norms are set up in the course of social interaction.

The concept of role

The role concept has been used in two different contexts. Anthropologists and sociologists interested mostly in communication and the inter-relationships of institutions use the term role to indicate the relation of individual activities to the larger organization of society. They thus view role as an aspect of social structure. Their emphasis is on social systems and institutions, on social requirements and normative expectations. But social psychologists like Mead bring in the concept of role to describe the processes of co-operative behaviour and of communication. For them it serves only to describe individual perception and socially relevant individual behaviour. Thus the concept of role stresses the shaping of individual responses and behaviour by social expectations or socially imposed norms.

Nor are psychologists quite agreed on any one definition of role. According to K. Young, "In every society and every group each member has some function or activity with which he is associated and which carries with it some degree of power or prestige. What the individual does or performs is his role." Sargent defines it as "a pattern or type of social behaviour which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of those in his group". E. E. Jones and H. B. Gerard combine the two aspects of role and define roles as "shared norms concerning the behaviour of certain persons in certain settings". Roles are always enacted by individuals, they are an aspect of social interaction apart from which they have no meaning, they refer to behaviour which is culturally and socially defined and which is relevant to the social situation as perceived by the individual, and its basic character is determined by the demands and expectations of group members as known through social experience. The group may be a small one as a family, office people, club, and the like, or it may be a very large one as community, political party or the nation.

Let us take a few examples. A school child, his old parent, a newly wedded bride, a merchant, and a national leader may all celebrate Diwali with nearly the same degree and amount of enthusiasm and interest but will do so in ways that are quite

different. ... is often ... differences will be due to the position of each individual. By position we do not mean his job or occupation but how he is perceived and known by other people and how their perceptions and knowledge of him is organized and standardized. We all function as holding a number of positions. A person is a father to his children, husband to his wife, a subordinate to his boss, an officer to his subordinates, member of a club, son of a Brahmin priest, shareholder in a co-operative store, cyclist on the road, customer, and so on. For each of these positions there are roles: sets, types or patterns of behaviour expected of everyone occupying the position. As a father he is expected to bring up his children, treat them with affection and make sacrifices for them. As a husband he is expected to support his wife, look after her happiness and share his life with her. He is expected to obey and submit to the orders of his boss and command and control his subordinates. Society and culture expect people to play these roles when they enter such situations. These roles have no meaning apart from social situations and outside our cultural setting, and they are associated with a pattern of behaviour which society demands and expects. Cycling on the road he is expected to keep to the left, overtake another cycle only on the right, obey the traffic signals, and the like. These are expectations and demands of society and he has learned them through social experience.

The concept of role has become popular in our own time mainly due to the monumental work done by M. Mead, Cameron, Sherif, Newcomb, Sargent, Moreno, and others. They all recognize the importance of situational influences as age, sex, occupation, family, group membership, and the like in understanding and explaining social behaviour. They find that such concepts as personality traits, attitudes, are not adequate. Nor are they satisfied with the common explanations of social interaction in terms of competition, conflict or co-operation. They prefer the concept of role because it includes them all and much more to cover the effects of social situations on behaviour. It is a concept which holds out promise of combining two important determinants of behaviour, personality and culture.

But the role concept has certain difficulties to face. It does not take into account the variations in role behaviour. Culture may expect a child to obey, a leader to command or a woman

to be patient and yet due to differ[illegible] in which they are placed there may be wide differences in their behaviour. In fact, the concept of role does not take into account the factor of situations—social behaviour is relevent to the social situation. In any undefined general situation like a new group or party, an individual may be led to play the role of a man of books, a religious man, a widely travelled person, a retired recluse and so on. How does this happen? The concept of role alone is not enough.

Social roles

Each human being is born in a society which is more or less organized, and in order to fit into it he must play a definite and predictable role. In homogeneous and relatively stable societies most roles are traditional. The place and function of each child is predetermined and he begins to see early what he is to become, and the old person sees in the young an image of what he once was. Under the ancient caste system in India the son of a Brahmin knew that he was to be a priest devoted to the study of religious scriptures, as the son of Kshatriya was sure to be a soldier. In such societies training for social roles was simple but effective. People who were cut out for definite roles got intensive training for them from the very beginning

It may be said that the social role is something which is imposed on an individual by the group This is true in the case of traditional social roles The caste imposed social roles rigidly and laid down expectations from each member. Even today the roles of a bride and her groom during the wedding ceremony are very rigidly prescribed and call for an inflexible pattern of behaviour

Some roles derived from 'office' are also defined very rigorously. The role of the King of England, the President of India, the Mayor of London, army officers and others who hold offices are governed by formal and clear codes of conduct indicating their powers, rights, duties, and obligations.

Persons whose behaviour is in line with role expectations reveal little of value for assessing their personal characteristics. When asked to describe such a person people do so with little confidence and avoid extreme statements. Persons whose behaviour deviates from role expectations reveal their personal charac-

different. S[illegible] is often [illegible] differences will be due to the position of each individual. By position we do not mean his job or occupation but how he is perceived and known by other people and how their perceptions and knowledge of him is organized and standardized. We all function as holding a number of positions. A person is a father to his children, husband to his wife, a subordinate to his boss, an officer to his subordinates, member of a club, son of a Brahmin priest, shareholder in a co-operative store, cyclist on the road, customer, and so on. For each of these positions there are roles: sets, types or patterns of behaviour expected of everyone occupying the position. As a father he is expected to bring up his children, treat them with affection and make sacrifices for them. As a husband he is expected to support his wife, look after her happiness and share his life with her. He is expected to obey and submit to the orders of his boss and command and control his subordinates. Society and culture expect people to play these roles when they enter such situations. These roles have no meaning apart from social situations and outside our cultural setting, and they are associated with a pattern of behaviour which society demands and expects. Cycling on the road he is expected to keep to the left, overtake another cycle only on the right, obey the traffic signals, and the like. These are expectations and demands of society and he has learned them through social experience.

The concept of role has become popular in our own time mainly due to the monumental work done by M. Mead, Cameron, Sherif, Newcomb, Sargent, Moreno, and others. They all recognize the importance of situational influences as age, sex, occupation, family, group membership, and the like in understanding and explaining social behaviour. They find that such concepts as personality traits, attitudes, are not adequate. Nor are they satisfied with the common explanations of social interaction in terms of competition, conflict or co-operation. They prefer the concept of role because it includes them all and much more to cover the effects of social situations on behaviour. It is a concept which holds out promise of combining two important determinants of behaviour, personality and culture.

But the role concept has certain difficulties to face. It does not take into account the variations in role behaviour. Culture may expect a child to obey, a leader to command or a woman

to be patient and yet due to differ[illegible] in which they are placed there may be wide differences in their behaviour. In fact, the concept of role does not take into account the factor of situations—social behaviour is relevent to the social situation. In any undefined general situation like a new group or party, an individual may be led to play the role of a man of books, a religious man, a widely travelled person, a retired recluse and so on. How does this happen? The concept of role alone is not enough.

Social roles

Each human being is born in a society which is more or less organized, and in order to fit into it he must play a definite and predictable role. In homogeneous and relatively stable societies most roles are traditional. The place and function of each child is predetermined and he begins to see early what he is to become, and the old person sees in the young an image of what he once was. Under the ancient caste system in India the son of a Brahmin knew that he was to be a priest devoted to the study of religious scriptures, as the son of Kshatriya was sure to be a soldier. In such societies training for social roles was simple but effective. People who were cut out for definite roles got intensive training for them from the very beginning

It may be said that the social role is something which is imposed on an individual by the group. This is true in the case of traditional social roles. The caste imposed social roles rigidly and laid down expectations from each member. Even today the roles of a bride and her groom during the wedding ceremony are very rigidly prescribed and call for an inflexible pattern of behaviour.

Some roles derived from 'office' are also defined very rigorously. The role of the King of England, the President of India, the Mayor of London, army officers and others who hold offices are governed by formal and clear codes of conduct indicating their powers, rights, duties, and obligations

Persons whose behaviour is in line with role expectations reveal little of value for assessing their personal characteristics. When asked to describe such a person people do so with little confidence and avoid extreme statements Persons whose behaviour deviates from role expectations reveal their personal charac-

teristics that is often [illegible]tion and form of such deviation. Their behaviour *is* considered to have been internally caused and therefore direct inferences can be drawn from it about the personal characteristics of the individual.

But one grows with cultural roles. The role of a son, woman, scholar, priest, nobleman or chief is provided by society and accepted by the individual. Children are taught to respect parents and priests. Harijan children are taught by their parents to show respect to members and children of higher castes. Teenage boys behave differently from teenage girls in the same society largely because they know that they are boys and are expected to behave like boys, not like girls. A boy who behaves like a girl or a girl who behaves like a boy is not tolerated. An unusually shy boy is abused for acting like a girl as a girl is scolded for being too forward and immodest like a boy. The manner in which a society is organized is best described in terms of positions which exist in that society for people to fill, and most persons occupy several positions; the same boy is a son, a brother, a hockey player from class nine, a captain in the class and so on, and his roles depend on those positions.

But along with cultural roles there are personal roles which are determined by the individual himself, and which allow considerable scope for individual initiative and discovery. Such differences in role behaviour or performance are tolerated as they are developed to meet the needs and opportunities of that role. The role of a dutiful son is enjoined on all young people in India but the way Shravan Kumar went about carrying his blind parents to places of pilgrimage was unique. Unique roles are shown by very few individuals. The role of wife shown by Savitri or Sita is a unique role. So is the role of a lover played by King Edward VIII of England. These roles are dependent on the personality of the individual.

But culture and personality are not the only determinants of roles. Some roles emerge from an individual's experience in specific situations. They are determined by his interpretation of the situation, that is, how he perceives the situation. The role of an orphan, a wise man, a neglected wife or a helpless old woman is played by an individual according to the situation in which he or she is placed. These are situational roles.

But this classification of roles does not mean that roles fall

into neat mutually exclusive groups [illegible]. In fact in any role cultural, personal and situational factors intermix, and the behaviour of the individual is determined by all of them. Take, for example, a guest attending a dinner party. Although he is not aware of it the guest arrives fully prepared to behave appropriate to the occasion He has some experience of such parties in the past. He greets the host cheerfully with folded hands, or may shake hands with the host and only salute or bow to the hostess. He will take a seat after the ladies are seated. If he is in the drawing-room he may stand as often as other guests arrive. Whatever rules of etiquette obtain in that social group he will follow. But still his behaviour is not mechanical or entirely predetermined. Certain topics he avoids in his conversation, but even from those topics which are approved he selects those which are suited to the occasion or on which conversation is already going on. His own contribution to the talk is determined by his study and experience, and by the study and experience of his listeners. At dinner he talks to his companions on right and left on topics in which they are likely to be interested *If he is the main guest he may go round and talk* to every guest referring to things and events with which they are connected. His talk will be congenial, courteous and suave. His social role is determined by his culture, personality and specific situations, as Sargent has pointedly stressed

But social roles are also greatly determined in a general way by such factors as age, sex, occupation, class, and the like The behaviour pattern of an individual is different at different ages, in childhood, boyhood, youth, middle age, and old age, because his social roles are different Again, as has already been pointed out, the role of a woman is different from the role of a man. There are feminine roles and masculine roles. Again the role *of a salesman is different from that of a policeman, a teacher or* a rickshaw-driver. A high class Brahmin or a high court judge has a different pattern of behaviour from that of a railway porter or a shoe-shine. Thus age, sex, occupation and class also determine social roles.

Some roles are very general. Every society lays down certain behaviour patterns which broadly define and limit the conduct of the members of that society. There are certain expectations and demands which every Hindu has to meet in his daily con-

duct. They is often general role as a Hindu. Similarly, there are general expectations of a male, female, soldier and the like. But roles of a station-master, speaker of a parliament, postman or signaller are specific roles. Larger systems of behaviour are broken into smaller and more specific systems indicating specific roles.

Social psychologists have stressed that most of the roles in society are reciprocal, and they give examples of parent-child, husband-wife, teacher-student, leader-follower or employer-employee roles. Perhaps it would be better to say that all roles are interlocked. They never stand in isolation but presuppose other roles with which they are interconnected. The very fact that social roles emerge in social interaction shows that they involve each other. Consider, for example, teacher-student roles. They imply several other roles. The teacher has to play several roles depending on the circumstances, as for example, a guardian, a man with a mission, a scholar, a man with an infinite patience, a mentor, a strong disciplinarian,. a speaker, a writer, a camp leader and so on. Similarly, a student may behave as a passive listener in the class, an obedient youngster, a player, debater, a critic, a rebel, a faithful follower, a bully and so on. The teacher is many things else and so is the student, and all these roles are interlocked to make up the larger system we call society. It is because of these roles that individual behaviour becomes predictable for social situations. Each individual perceives the other individual in a definite role and adjusts his own behaviour accordingly.

Role-taking

A role may be a way of communicating, meeting certain needs or accomplishing certain goals, organizing a relationship or resolving what might be an awkward situation. But roles are learned and acquired through a long process of growth and development during which the patterns of responses of an individual are most intricately organized through interaction between organism and environment, or between organism and other organisms. In this process of organization language plays a very significant part. It helps to organize the system of responses as also the environmental factors. That is why we as human beings are constantly defining and labelling situations and trying

to determine the behaviour most suited to any...

It is a commonplace observation that no two persons take the same role in exactly the same way. Of all teachers, fathers or priests, each does his duties and responds to his fellows in his own way. This uniqueness is partly due to constitutional factors and partly to conditions of social interaction. The child is greatly influenced by people with whom he interacts in early life and early ways of taking roles persist in later life.

Learning to take roles is accompanied by learning to differentiate oneself from others. Although our social heritage is the same our perception of ourselves is different and unique. As he enacts his roles the individual is constantly engaged in communicating with himself and figuring out what his part in the situation is or should be. There is a large variety of ways in which he can respond to a situation, but role expectations and demands require that he make certain responses at certain times and places, and in a certain order. His self-perception, that is, his conception of his role determines what responses he will make. Irrelevant responses are avoided and appropriate responses are reinforced. Role-taking also involves continuous self-appraisal—the person should be continuously reviewing his actions in the light of where they lead to and how they affect others. How in any society people are so much concerned with the conduct of others, commending or condemning it, shows that role taking or enactment is constantly appraised by the person himself and by others.

'Role-taking' is distinguished from 'role-playing' which is a larger concept including the former. It is taking the role of another by imagining or actually using the gestures, postures, words, and accents of someone else and by drawing upon his past experience of that person making responses which are similar to those of the other person. It involves an understanding of the motives of the other person and of their values and ideals. In psychology the terms 'empathy' and 'identification' are used for role-taking. When role-taking is too effective it may interfere with a person's serious acting. It leads to understanding other person's thoughts and feelings and if a doctor, policeman or soldier was too much concerned with the thoughts and feelings of his patients, prisoners or enemies, his main role may be affected. They, therefore, are given professional training which kills their

role-taking abnormal enables them to pursue their own roles properly.

Morena has employed role-taking in psychotherapy. He calls it 'psychodrama' or 'sociodrama'. If a person is victim of a serious conflict because of trouble in marital relations, he is asked to act out scenes from his married life, and this is supposed to give him an objective view of the situation and his trouble. Role-acting or psychodrama, was first used in the study of social behaviour, in marriage counselling, and in the treatment of disturbed patients. More recently, role-acting techniques have proved valuable as an aid to training in schools and industries. They help to indicate adjustment difficulties, to release feelings which cannot be expressed in words, to gain experience of other people's problems, and to try other modes of behaviour. Used with groups they help to broaden understanding of a common problem. Students taking courses in education, social work, industrial relations can use them to get the 'hang' or 'feel' of social roles. Role-acting is also being used in industry to help train supervisors.

Social status

The status of an individual is closely related to his role. In fact in sociology the two terms are used interchangeably, but there is a difference. Status is the position and degree of acceptance given to an individual by others; it is the position occupied by a person relative to the needs of society; it is the prestige value of his position. It does not necessarily imply high position or position of eminence, but position in the social hierarchy. Role is activity, what one does. Each individual has a certain status in his own community as well as in each group with which he is associated. The respect he enjoys in his community, his influence with people, his standing in his profession and social life are due in large part to the social roles he plays.

Prestige in determined by the function and importance of cultural roles. A leader is generally given more respect than a member, but that member may be a leader in other fields. A president enjoys greater prestige than a secretary. In different cultures and at different times, high social status has been given to warriors, philosophers, kings, priests and generals. In the Middle Ages kings and popes ruled supreme, today elected leaders

and ministers command greater prestige. There are persons who carry many roles and are given greater prestige. In a truly democratic set-up film stars, artists, scientists, authors, champions in games, inventors, businessmen, social reformers, in fact all those who contribute to make community living richer and fuller are given respect and prestige. Political power or financial control also means prestige but many people who wield power are often cursed behind their back.

The social prestige of some roles is easily generalized. Not only do the wife and sons acquire the status and prestige the person enjoys but other members of his family also claim respectability on that account. In India high caste has great status value, and many claim to be descendants of former princes

Status depends on the perceived value the person has for the group, and this value depends on those qualities and attributes which the community thinks important. Today athletes, film stars, entertainers, and musicians are as much honoured as professional people, scientists and authors, because in our culture these roles are very important.

In a highly organized society there are hierarchies of roles and statuses. In universities we have professors, readers, lecturers and tutors. In many secretarial offices we have a secretary, additional secretary, joint secretary, deputy secretary and so on In some organizations there are obvious outward signs by which status is known. In Government offices the status of an officer is known by the number of peons attending on him, in the army and the police there are stripes on the arm indicating rank Ordinarily the status of a person is judged by the car he drives, the clothes he wears, the class of people he associates with, and the like.

In old cultures roles and statuses are ascribed to individuals by cultural norms without any consideration of an individual's ability, strength or choice. It is a matter of 'who you are' and status is assigned because of birth, family, race, agé, sex. This is a case of inherited success, of being born with a silver spoon.

In our culture, status tends to be earned or achieved through individual effort How much intelligence, time, education, hard work and the like go into the making of a successful man in competitive struggle of today is obvious to all those who are working for it. In the choice of a mate, profession or mode of life there is freedom, and status is accorded not only to the successful but

to those who use approved means of achieving success.

Modern civilized society is tending to become an 'open society' free from class barriers, and there is a powerful tendency to accord status only on merit of performance.

Roles and statuses have an important influence on personality traits, attitudes and ideas. Even on the assumption of ascribed roles people assume new postures, and many newly and rapidly made rich people learn the manners and poses of high society.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

ROHRER and SHERIF, *Social Psychology at the Crossroads* (New York: Harper & Brothers).

SHERIF and SHERIF, *An Outline of Social Psychology* (New York: Harper & Brothers).

YOUNG, K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.).

NEWCOMB, T. M. *Social Psychology* (London: Tavistock Publishers Ltd.).

YOUNG, K. *Personality and Problems of Adjustment* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.).

LINDESMITH and STRAUSS, *Social Psychology* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston).

MURPHY, G., MURPHY, L. and NEWCOMB, T. *Experimental Social Psychology* (New York: Harper & Brothers).

SARGENT, S. S. and WILLIAMSON, R. C. *Social Psychology* (New York: The Ronald Press Company).

CHAPTER IX

THE SELF AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

THE CONCEPT of self has had a long history. Philosophers long wrestled with the relationship of the subject and the object, the knower and the known, the self and the world Psychology, anxious to be scientific, rejected the idea of self as it could not be investigated by scientific methods. But social psychology, child psychology and clinical psychology have brought the idea of self back into the field of psychological study. Social psychology studying individual behaviour in society needs a concept which will help to mark off one individual from another, to identify him in a group, to integrate and unify his experiences and behaviour in his day to day activities and to account for man's social nature or the process of socialization. For example, Snygg and Comb in their book *Individual Psychology* (Harper, N.Y.) emphasize what has come to be known as the 'perceptual approach' in explaining social behaviour. According to them behaviour is determined by how an individual perceives himself and his environment. The individual's view of himself is his 'self-concept—who he is'. Because he is personally involved in his environment as shown by his claims 'my house', 'my college', 'our street', this environment is also a part of his self. Snygg and Comb call it the 'phenomenal self' Other social psychologists also think in similar terms Lewin calls it 'personal field', other psychologists refer to it as 'psychological field' This field is very real to the individual Child psychology too needs the concept of self to differentiate the physiological-psychological make-up of the child from those of the people around him to account for his growing awareness of his own personality and to render a more intelligible account of his social development. Abnormal psychology presupposes a reference to self in all discussions of defence mechanisms and psychoneuroses. Freud's theory of personality stresses the need of harmonious relationship between

the *id*, the *ego* and the *superego;* the ego or self is for ever trying to bring about an adjustment between the demands of animal nature and moral conscience. In psychoanalysis one of the aims of therapy is to increase self-esteem of the patient and to correct faulty self-evaluations. G. W. Allport has attacked selfless psychologies and stressed the functional autonomy of self and its motives, and most of the present-day psychologists are in favour of reviving the idea of self in psychology.

The nature of self

The concept of self is so persistent and prevalent in human thinking that questions about its nature have been raised from time to time. We have the time-honoured statement of Descartes, 'I think, therefore, I am', and the statement of F. H. Bradley though not so well known but nonetheless significant, 'Besides that which at any moment is experienced, you have also the thing to which that experience belongs'. But we have to confine ourselves to the nature of the social self.

G. Murphy says that the 'self is the individual as known to the individual', it is the way in which one perceives oneself. It is the centre of anybody's experience, thoughts, emotions, attitudes, knowledge and sentiments. Even the most unselfish person may be described as having made the quality of selflessness as a dominant part of his self-image.

William James, the American psychologist, drew attention to the social components of the self. 'In the widest possible sense of man's self is the sum total of all that he can call his, not only his body and his psychic powers, but his clothes and his house, his wife and children, his ancestors and friends, his reputation and works, his land and horses, and yacht and bank account. All these things give him the same emotions. If they wax and prosper, he feels triumphant; if they dwindle and die away, he feels cast down—not necessarily in the same degree, but in much the same way for all.'* Because of our gregariousness, James goes on to say, 'a man has as many social selves as there are individuals who recognize him . . . as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinions he cares. He generally shows a different side of himself to each of these different groups.' Thus the social nature of self came to be emphasized.

* *Principles of Psychology*, p. 291.

J. M. Baldwin stressed that the self is a product of social interaction. 'A man is a social outcome rather than a social unit', and therefore the main task of social psychology is to trace the growth and development of the individual in his constant interaction with his social environment. The social environment includes language, art, play, inventions and the like all of which are necessary for the growth of the self.*

The pioneer work of Baldwin was continued by C. H. Cooley who recognized that the personality of the individual is markedly influenced by his conception of his role in the social group, it is a social product emerging from the give-and-take relation with others, and all the ideas, persons and activities with which the individual identifies himself are included in the self. Cooley coined the term 'looking-glass self', by which he meant that the individual's behaviour is the reflection of: (1) what he imagines he appears to be to other people, (2) what he thinks the judgement of the other person is regarding such appearance, and (3) a resultant self-feeling, such as pride or humiliation. Our self-estimates depend on interaction with others, and we are socialized by a feeling for the judgement of us held by others. By 'others' Cooley meant mostly primary, intimate face-to-face groups like the family, neighbourhood or play group It is here that most of the virtues, ideals and attitudes of man are born and developed.

He wrote: 'In a very large and interesting class of cases the social reference takes the form of a somewhat definite imagination of how one's self... appears in a particular mind, and the kind of self-feeling one has is determined by the attitude toward this attributed to that other mind. A social self of this sort might be called the reflected or looking-glass self:

"Each to each a looking glass
Reflects the other that doth pass."

As we see our face, figure and dress in the glass, and are interested in them because they are ours, and pleased or otherwise with them according as they or do not answer to what we should like them to be; so in imagination we perceive in another's mind some

* *Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development* (New York. The Macmillan Company)

thought of our appearance, manners, aims, deeds, character, friends, and so on, and are variously affected by it.

A self-idea of this sort seems to have three principal elements: the imagination of our appearance to the other person; the imagination of his judgment of that appearance, and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or humiliation.'*

M. Mead emphasized the importance of role-taking in the development of the self in children. The child identifies himself with his brothers, sisters, parents, postman, hawker, and the like. He acts out their roles, learns a large number of words, habits, attitudes, and behaviour of others, and gradually a good part of them as his own. These become a part of his personality. Through experiences of different roles he develops his own general role, his self-image. Mead takes over the concepts of 'me' and 'I' from W. James and argues that through experiences of different roles the child acquires the 'me', and becomes an object to himself in addition to the 'I' which is the subject, the actor in him making his personality unique and dynamic.

With these views of three social psychologists before us let us try to analyse the concept of self into simpler terms and characteristics.

In the first place the self is an integrating concept which is necessary to account for stability, consistency and continuity in the behaviour and social and other relations of the individual. This consistency and stability is found in different individuals in varying degrees and indicates the degree of integration of the self in several aspects of life and behaviour. Without this integrating principle the individual would drift rudderless in a stormy sea of impulses and whims, and his social and other relations would be disturbed. When we say 'I hate myself', 'I am a problem to myself' or 'I will look into the matter myself' we are referring to the self in action, the consistent, continuing and stable principle regulating our life and behaviour.

The self is both an object and a subject, an object to be known and the knower. Too often the self is identified with the body. There is no doubt that in order to have a self we must have a body. That is why some psychologists have spoken of the 'physical self' apart from the 'social self'. A person perceives and evaluates his body, and his ideas about his health, strength,

* *Human Nature and the Social Order* (New York: Scribners).

looks and body-build enter into thinking and regard for himself. He may take pride or feel small because of his physical self. But the self is more than the body.

From this dualism of the knower and the known, the 'I' and the 'me' emerges the fact of self-consciousness Self-awareness is a common element in all definitions of self and is essential to it. As Mead points out, the individual acquires a self when he becomes an object to himself. 'It is the total person as object to that person'. Self-awareness is the ability of man to distinguish between *his* body, his *person*, and *his* personality on the one hand and that which is *not* his on the other. It is the distinction between *self* and *not-self* that is crucial. The process of becoming aware of one's own hands in contrast to the hands of other persons, of one's own social attitudes and social values in contrast to those of other persons is the process which gives rise to the self.

But the distinction between the two aspects of the self, the 'I' and the 'me' should not be stretched too far because the 'me' is for ever reacting on the 'I' and the 'I' is for ever becoming a part of the 'me'. My experiences and behaviour are reacting and contributing to my self and my personality in its totality is never fully present in my consciousness Almost everybody is shocked to hear his own recorded voice or to see himself on the movie screen, and it shows more than anything else that there are many aspects of one's personality of which one may long be unaware. Therefore the self is not the equivalent of personality

Again, the self arises in social interaction. The individual becomes a self only through give-and-take processes, through socialization. Social interaction involves processes of opposition and co-operation in which individuals influence and modify each others' actions. Actions of one individual call forth reactions in other individuals and these influence the later acts of the first individual. Thus every individual learns to modify and control his actions in terms of what others expect of him. Such expectancies help to fix and regulate habits, attitudes and ideas, and to predict in advance how people will react to given social situations. Such expectations and demands bring about consistency and continuity in behaviour and make the individual aware of himself.

Lastly, the self is the outcome of a long process of develop-

ment. Recent investigations in the fields of social psychology, child psychology and abnormal psychology have shown that the self grows and develops in relation to other persons, groups, objects, institutions, and values. The 'not-self', the 'phenomenal self', or the 'psychological field' made up of physical, social, and cultural environment is for ever influencing and modifying our ideas about ourselves. We identify ourselves with our family, community, caste, religion, nation, and a host of other objects, institutions and ideals, and what we are is made up of a number of attitudes about ourselves and the world around us. These attitudes and their organization and integration into a system we call the self is the result of a long process of development.

Let us discuss these characteristics in detail.

The development of self

For the infant at birth there is no distinction between self and not-self. He has to learn the distinction. In infancy behaviour is based on the pleasure-pain principle. The drives to activity produce random movements of crying, kicking or waving arms. The mother responds, and pleasure or pain results from the nature of the response. Those random activities which give pleasure are selected for repetition and those which give pain tend to be discontinued. But the question may still be asked why the same response gives pleasure to the individual at one time, and pain at another, and why a response may be pleasurable to one individual and painful to another.

The answer to these questions can be found only in the growing identification of the individual with selective elements of his cultural environment. In the satisfaction of his biogenic needs the child needs help from adults and accepts their control, and in doing so, conforms to their demands and norms. In feeding, sleeping and elimination he accepts the limitations of time and place through interaction with others. When biogenic needs are gratified in the context of the social norms of the group cultural variations are stamped in and the child identifies himself with the primary groups in which he is brought up. Through identification he assimilates the social norms of the group. This is not a very simple or easy process, and each society has formulated rules and regulations, customs and traditions, laws and values, with the help of which the individual is brought into a

definite social pattern. To begin with the child is egocentric, absorbed in, and concerned with, his own needs and interests and their gratification. But with social learning and development he identifies himself with his cultural group and his needs and interests are the same as those of his group.

Later he rises above the cultural norms through wider and closer contacts with a variety of cultural situations and patterns. He is no longer keen to conform nor is he any longer devoted to his cultural norms In fact he has developed his own norms which hold good for the whole of humanity and his universal outlook helps him to look at his cultural norms critically and he may contribute to their reconstruction and reform.

In this process of growth the infant's behaviour in the beginning becomes associated with such responses of others as the tone of the voice of the mother, her singing, smiling or scowling and the faces, features and voices of other members of the family. He becomes increasingly aware of other people around him, and through varied and widening relationships begin to develop generalized concepts of types of behaviour which are approved or disapproved, as determined by the responses of others. Many small children use anger as a means of getting things done. If they succeed they persist in their exhibition of temper, but if they are ignored their anger tends to disappear. This is the beginning of self-control. The child smiles because it knows that smiling pays, but sooner or later there arise occasions when his smiling is not applauded, and he begins to discriminate between such occasions So through a series of experiences certain behaviour patterns are selected This process is speeded up by growth in the use of language. Words replace tones of voice or facial expression and are equally effective in helping the child to select behaviour patterns. Words of warning, praise or blame are used in place of concrete reactions to specific acts.

Later the child learns to anticipate responses and the probable consequences of his acts Imagination and reasoning speed up this process. Often he talks to himself, imitates the tone of others or acts out their roles. In such varied responses to others there arises a consciousness of self and it is associated with feelings of gratification when praised and of humiliation when blamed. Playing and participating in group activities the child

develops general concepts of the roles of things and people, and out of these experiences the individual also recognizes his own role. At first his role is in terms of the responses of others toward his behaviour but soon through imagination he begins to anticipate their responses and to assume the role which others ascribe to him. He learns to play certain roles because of the images which he receives of himself and of responses from others. He perceives his own acts in terms of other people's reactions of approval, disapproval or indifference and the like. It is in the context of such interactions that the sense of self arises.

Social interaction

We have already discussed the several processes of social interaction in detail in a previous chapter. A few facts in connection with the development of self have to be stressed.

Readers are already familiar with the large-scale process of identification in the socialization of the child. He is for ever taking into his own thought and behaviour the thoughts and actions of others. By assuming other people's attitudes, postures, habits, and roles the child seeks to reduce its tensions. Empathy is also a form of identification and in the beginning it is largely unconscious. It is basic to co-operation and sympathy, and confined to mother. In feeding, bathing, being carried over and other activities the child identifies himself with the mother. Later it is extended to other members of the family and outsiders. *The individual feels, speaks, and acts for the group to* which he thinks he belongs. He identifies himself with a number of groups and thinks in terms of 'we'. Social and community life is entirely dependent on the ability of the individual members to identify themselves with the wants, demands, goals and methods of obtaining satisfaction of the group. This is the basis of group co-operation and solidarity.

It is in these processes of identification that the self has its origin. The feeling of self arises in our relations with others, and how we take over the attitudes, habits, postures and ideas of others. One result of this identification is that the individual internalizes, that is, adopts as his own, the moral codes and activities of those with whom he identifies himself. This is spoken of as *introjection*. 'When we say that a child introjects his mother, we mean that her act toward him becomes an image asso-

ciated with his act toward her. In the rise of the self, the process of introjection consists in our taking the responses of others into ourselves and associating them with our own responses We learn to act toward ourselves, moreover, as others have reacted toward us'.* The rise of the conscience, the moral self rests on the introjections of moral maxims and codes of conduct which we accept from others, and we punish ourselves for violations of such codes in the same manner as others have punished us for such violations.

Role-taking

Role-taking is an essential part of the development of a child. Identifying himself with his mother, brother, sister or father, and playing at being mama, daddy, big brother, policeman or postman he acts out the roles and even talks out the parts. Some of these roles are real and some imaginary, but altogether they play an important part in the socialization of the child. There are some roles which are expected of the child, he must be a good student, a dutiful son, a kind brother to his sister or a helpful neighbour. These roles and the learned patterns of expected behaviour are internalized and become an integral part of his personality. When he has to play a number of roles some kind of integration or synthesis of these roles comes about. An individual is a father at home, an officer in the army, a member of a club, the son of a priest and so on. 'In time the introjections of the various roles of the child begin to get organized or integrated into a larger pattern of response, perhaps because many of these imagined roles actually overlap', and there arises a generalized and more or less total role of the individual. This becomes a part of the integrated self which grows up in everyday social interaction. A significant part of this role is the individual's conception of himself or self-image.

But is the self a mere integration of specific roles the child has learned to play from others? Mead thinks that these roles merely make up the 'me' over and above which is the 'I', 'which is the self as actor and which gives the personality its unique and dynamic character'. These are two phases of the self

* K. Young, *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd), p. 124.

Self-consciousness

The new-born baby is not conscious of himself. He has to develop self-awareness. His actions are determined by his bodily needs and not by any reference to a self. There is no evidence of any biologically inherited self-feeling. The ability of the individual to be an object to himself, and to have feelings about oneself, is essential to the rise of self and obviously takes several years of childhood to develop. 'The essentials of this process of becoming an object arise from the introjection into our own reaction system of the response of another person to us. That is to say, one perceives himself only after he has perceived others.'*

To begin with the infant takes time even to be conscious of his body. He has no conception of what belongs to his body and what does not. He pulls, bites or scratches different parts of his body as if they were objects external to him. Gradually he learns the boundaries of his bodily map and his undifferentiated perception of his body begins to be marked out into perceptions of different parts.

Even after he has learned to distinguish between his body and the external world, he does not have full self-awareness. He often confuses what belongs to him with what does not belong to him. Detailed studies made by Piaget reveal that the child often identifies himself with material objects and feels pain when they are broken or cut. He has great difficulty in making a proper use of pronouns and it is only very gradually that he becomes conscious of himself apart from his group. This is possible only through a long process of socialization. As has been said above the sense of self arises only through social interaction.

The development of self-consciousness rests upon the perception and conception of the individual's roles and statuses. 'How do I look to other persons? What are they thinking of me? What kind of impression am I making?' are questions he is compelled to ask in a number of social situations, even though the people around him are very well known to him. Imagination plays havoc with his nerves and he feels very self-conscious when, for example, he is asked to make a speech in the class or face the audience for recitation. The more he reflects and imagines the

* K. Young, *Personality and Problems of Adjustment* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.), p. 157.

more heightened his self-consciousness is. That is why it is said that self-consciousness is a reflective process, and depends on understanding the reactions we produce in others. Cooley's concept of the *looking-glass self* describes in a nutshell how the self develops out of social interaction. We have already referred to it in detail. The looking-glass analogy helps to understand the fact that one knows what he is like only by accurately interpreting the reflected attitudes and actions of those around him. Man is highly dependent upon his fellowmen not only for the satisfaction of most of his drives and desires but also for his awareness of himself.

Here it may be pertinent to draw a distinction between personality and self. The concept of personality refers to the overall organization of adjustment in the individual, an organized pattern of behaviour made up of drives and needs and emotional reactions. It also refers to the stability and continuity of certain features of activity during the changes and modifications of adjustments. Although some responses change the overall pattern retains an identity and appears to others as the distinguishing mark of personality. The individual perceives this identity in the midst of changing responses and his private view of his personality is his concept of self Each person arrives at a notion of the self during the early years of childhood, and observing his own body, activities and attitudes begins to distinguish himself from others Apart from the public view of personality each one of us appraises and assesses himself in the light of the ideal person he would very much like to be and which he never quite becomes. Self-consciousness enables him to be his own severe critic and to strive and achieve higher.

The role of language

The role of language in the development of the self and self-consciousness is very important, and psychologists have recognized this role and emphasized it in a variety of ways Some have stressed that language provides anchorage points for self in names, addresses, forms of salutations and the like Others have pointed out that the use of child's name by parents provides the starting point for the development of self and self-consciousness. Still others hold that the use of pronouns by both the child and other members of the family helps to build ideas of self.

Learning a language helps the growth and development of the child. He is not only enabled to speak and communicate with others but is also able to place himself and others in certain classes and categories, and to associate certain values to them. It is with the help of language that he builds up his value system and places objects of the outside world in an hierarchy of values, that he comes in contact with the rest of the world even with that part of the world which he is never going to visit, with his past and future, with his social heritage and with his dreams and hopes for himself and his groups with whom he has identified himself by one role or another, and that he begins to think of what he is and what he can and should become. Language provides experience of other selves through communication, and if it is in terms of other people's reactions to ourselves that the idea of self is born and developed, language is an indispensable means of developing self and self-consciousness.

Language is very necessary in learning to perceive oneself as a person, and before children have acquired some mastery of the language they are not able to distinguish themselves as persons from other persons. To begin with the child makes a large number of sounds at random but gradually he begins to select those which remove his discomforts and satisfy his needs, and starts repeating them. As the words 'ma', 'water' or 'milk' bring relief they are used again and again, and for objects fulfilling his needs. This is an important step when the child begins to differentiate between sounds and to apply them to appropriate objects. G. H. Mead has pointed out that in using language the child stimulates himself and other people when he uses his voice. Hearing himself speak he can react to his own words and is led to speak more. 'He has set up a "chain reaction" of internal conversation; he has begun to think.'* In this way not only is he an object to himself but he also perceives and reacts to himself.

Motives, emotions and self

We have so far treated the subject of self only in relation to the social environment and interaction. Now we turn to the place and role of motives and emotions in the development of

* T. M. Newcomb, *Social Psychology* (London: Tavistock Publishers Ltd.). p. 315.

the self and self-consciousness. In dealing with the 'Dynamics of Behaviour' in a previous chapter we have dealt with certain derived motives such as the need for affection, the need for security, power and mastery, and the need for belongingness and sociability. All these motives are closely related to self. The behaviourists generally explain the interplay of motives by the law of effect, by rewards and punishments. But man does not always go by rewards and punishments Our history is full of examples of people who suffered torture, imprisonments and death rather than give up a cause which they held dear. Christ, Galileo, Buddha, and Gandhi were not actuated by any thought of earthly rewards. They had developed a way of life, certain interests, ideals and values which they held more dear than life and its rewards. Most of these martyrs had a powerful sense of self-respect, they were very self-assertive, and they had so completely identified themselves with the cause and the ideals and values implicit in it that they sacrificed their life and happiness to uphold it. Their motivation was very strong and persistent and all of their emotions were associated with the goal. Often the goal was just a mirage and eluded their reach But they died fighting, satisfied and happy that they had made an effort toward the realization of their goal.

Again the artist who for the sake of free self-expression devotes his life to writing poetry, painting pictures or composing music toils for the sake of his art irrespective of the fact that he has to pass his days in abject poverty and put in long hours of work. His reward is the work itself. The sadhu or the saint who goes about doing service to the common people considers such service as its own reward. It would be very unfair to say that they seek fame because most of them simply do not care. They seek only self-approval

Emotions too play an important part in the development of self-awareness. Emotions and desires grow up and become organized around the idea of self The sentiment of self-regard grows out of a series of experiences relating to the prestige and to the goals and ideals pursued by an individual 'I am not the person to stoop so low', 'I belong to this or that type of family and cannot compromise myself', or 'what will my friends think of me?' and similar thoughts and feelings reflect our self-image and contribute to our ideas and ideals of ourselves around which an

emotionally toned attitude called sentiment comes to be organized. All normal people are dominated by this sentiment for self-regard and it is all-powerful because it is a sentiment for self in which all parts of my self are included. We have already discussed the several types of defense mechanisms like rationalization, compensation, projection, and they are all devices to defend and protect the self, and may, in a way, be said to be motivated by a sentiment for self-regard, though such motivation is unconscious.

In highly integrated personalities the sentiment of self-regard is organized around some ideal with which they identify themselves. Then the sentiment is for the ideal self which they are striving to reach. Mahatma Gandhi had completely identified himself with the ideals of truth, non-violence and *ahimsa,* for him these ideals were emotionally toned, and his entire life and behaviour was inspired by these ideals so much so that his joys and sorrows were linked with the success and failure of these ideals. No danger and sacrifice was too great for the propagation and promotion of these ideals, and the entire life and behaviour of Mahatma Gandhi was regulated and controlled by them. This is the stage of ideal or moral self.

The Ideal Self

The "ego ideal" which Freud refers to as an aspect of the super-ego serves as a reference point or standard in controlling behaviour. Other psychologists describe it as the "ideal self", that is, the ideal self or person the individual likes and strives to be. One may thus draw a line between the actual or real self an individual is and the self he ought to have been or ought to be. Social psychologists stress that if the gap between the real self and the ideal self is too large to be bridged it results in poor mental health, and the individual is an easy victim to anxiety, self-hate and feelings of inferiority, and is a great obstacle in the way of self-acceptance. This gap between the real self and the ideal self tends to increase between the ages of 11 and 17, that is during adolescence when young people are looking up to ideal persons as their models and identifying themselves with them. The more intelligent adolescents show greater gap than less intelligent ones. To keep anxiety within reasonable limits a more comfortable relationship between the real and the ideal self should be brought about.

Self-esteem

The amount of value and importance we attach to the self is our "self-esteem". It is largely the result of social interaction and is learnt from others. It is a reflection of how the individual reacts to other people's opinion of himself. If other people constantly find fault with us, threaten or speak ill of us we are very likely to think poorly of ourselves, to have any self-esteem, but if they applaud and praise us and express high opinions about us, we are likely to think ourselves important and have a high self-esteem. But only if we accept the opinions of others, if we consider them worthwhile. Thus a person's self-esteem indirectly determines his evaluation of the opinions of others His self-esteem depends on how he perceives himself and his self-perception is largely determined by his relations with others, not what others *feel* about him but what he *thinks* they feel about him

Self-esteem is an attitude each has toward himself and must be preserved at all costs. Its weakness must never be exposed. and whenever the individual finds it difficult to maintain it, whenever failure threatens it or unsavoury events endanger it, the individual resorts to all kinds of self-deceptions which have been described as defence mechanisms in an earlier chapter

Ego-involvement

The concept of *ego-involvement* was first put forward by Sherif and Contril in their book, *The Psychology of Ego-involvement*, published in 1947. According to them the ego is a cluster of attitudes related to what the individual considers *me, I, my, mine*. These ego attitudes determine the more or less enduring aspects of an individual's personality In a more recent book, *An Outline of Social Psychology* by M. Sherif and C W Sherif, the ego is defined as a sub-system in the psychological make-up of the individual consisting of attitudes which are acquired in relation to his own body, to objects, family, persons, groups, social values, and institutions, and which define and regulate his relations to them in concrete situations Obviously such an ego is the outcome of a process of development. Now when the experience and behaviour of an individual is determined by ego-attitudes it is said to be ego-involved. Our behaviour and experience depends on two factors, external and internal. The external factor consists of objects, stimuli and situations existing indepen-

dently of the person and internal factors consist of his needs, motives, goals or social incentives. When ego-attitudes enter the internal factor the bevaviour and experience becomes ego-involved.

Let us take an example. All fathers are interested in the education of their children. They attend to their educational needs, provide them with fees, books and clothes, ask them a question or two about their work and progress, help them near the examination and are satisfied or disappointed if their children pass or fail. But some fathers somehow come to acquire a pride in their children. They think their children better than those of their neighbours or friends, and want them to excel the latter. In fact they want them to stand first in studies, games and what not. Every time their children do less their self-respect is injured and they take it as their personal failure. So they coach them, coax them, are obsessed with their progress and take unusual measures and interest to ensure their rank in the school. Such motives are ego-involved, they are affected by anticipations of other people's reactions in ways which affect one's own evaluation of oneself. People will applaud their children and their prestige will be boosted.

It is obvious that ego-involved behaviour is very selective and the individual perceives, judges, remembers, acts, strives and scores more effectively. His psychological processes are heightened; he is more sensitive in every way, and concentrating on relevant goals and stimuli he displays greater consistency and continuity in his behaviour. That is why people who have identified themselves with certain ideals and goals are highly integrated and they are so closely involved in their causes that they work and live for them consistently and with astonishing single-mindedness. They are deaf and dumb to details to which other people attend. Cronin's *Hatter's Castle* illustrates ego-involvement of a hatter. Tolstoi, Gandhi, Lenin, and Lincoln did not look upon their life and work as one of routine, they were intensely preoccupied with their missions.

Behaviour which is not ego-involved is determined by external stimuli. The individual reacts to what he sees, hears or touches, and his life is one of mechanical routine. Too much social apathy and indifference to civic problems is due to lack of ego-involvement among people. They are not inclined to take ac-

tive interest and identify themselves with the community. Individualism and detachment prevent them putting their heart and soul into social campaigns for sanitation, for honesty or efficiency in civic administration or for civil liberties. It is only the individual who is ego-involved who makes a mission of everything that he undertakes Therefore ego-involvement affects the course and intensity of social behaviour at all levels.

Dissociation and breakdown of the ego

Although the individual is a different person to different people and enacts different roles in different social settings the processes of integration start fairly early. In the course of development the life and behaviour of an individual soon shows consistency and regularity so as to enable us to predict his reactions to some extent. Specific roles are organized into generalized roles and the habits, attitudes and ideas accompanying different roles tend to be co-ordinated into an organized system. In early years primary motives of hunger, thirst, sleep, avoiding pain or elimination regulate and organize the child's behaviour, and later some goal or activity dominates to effect some integration of the various roles and some organization of a large variety of experiences. The generalized role of a good man, an upright leader or a strict person becomes a unifying factor for different roles and experiences. Then there is greater stability, consistency, regularity, and continuity in the experiences and behaviour of the individual.

But this relatedness and integration may break down and there may be disruption in the stabilized modes of behaviour, in ego-involved attitudes. In moments and situations of great stress because of some internal states of fear or anxiety or of some shocking experience the consistency and stability of behaviour may be lost.

Let us take a few examples. Under the influence of strong drink the individual begins to talk at the level of a child Regression is common with alcoholics. People in extreme panic or haunted by hunger and starvation lose all considerations of dignity and self-respect and beg for food or shelter in a very abject manner. War and famine-torn populations stoop to any level of behaviour to obtain food Parents sell children and women sell

themselves to keep their body and soul together. Their selves are subordinated to their physiological requirements. There are a few highly integrated selves who resist the onslaughts of hunger and fear, and support their ego values in the face of heavy odds, but such heroic people are few.

Similarly, brain injury or extreme frustrations disrupt the self and the individual loses stability and consistency of behaviour. Prolonged unemployment with a family to support unhinges the mind of even very strong people, and if there is no state provision for the unemployed breakdowns of the ego are common. In India suicides due to unemployment are fairly frequent. Some of them are due to frustrations in marriage, occupation or other areas of life and work.

Dissociation is the opposite of integration and implies that there is variety and variations among motives, and some of these and behaviour to which they lead are not associated with unifying system of behaviour called self. Such motives are separate and the behaviour takes place independently. We have already spoken of the autonomy of motives. Walking, standing or maintaining bodily balance is carried on while the individual is busy reading, talking or thinking. Such dissociation is normal and helps adaptation and efficiency.

In an abnormal form dissociation results in dual or multiple personalities. Or rather personality is split into two or more parts which have nothing to do with each other, so much so that one part of the personality does not know what the other is thinking or doing. There are two distinct and separate self-organizations. Oneness, wholeness and freedom from conflicting elements which is implied by integration are replaced by divergence, fragmentation and strong conflicts. Integration has failed and the pathological condition is described as *split personality* or *multiple personality*.

These multiple systems of social behaviour are not reconcilable, and the person, unable to drop either of them and thereby resolve the conflict, develops amnesia. Multiple personalities are often described as alternating personalities. James and Morton Prince have given striking examples of cases of split or multiple personalities, and these represent extreme instances of tendencies dormant in all of us. But they lend weight to the general

contention of Mead that in both dissociation and integration, memory and forgetting play a very important part.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

SHERIF and SHERIF, *An Outline of Social Psychology* (New York: Harper & Brothers)

SARGENT S S and WILLIAMSON R C, *Social Psychology* (New York: The Ronald Press Company).

YOUNG, K *Personality and Problems of Adjustment* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.)

YOUNG, K *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd)

NEWCOMB, T. M. *Social Psychology* (London: Tavistock Publishers Ltd.)

LINDESMITH and STRAUSS, *Social Psychology* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston)

CHAPTER X

ATTITUDES AND THEIR MEASUREMENT

A FEW DECADES ago, when the concept of attitude became popular, it seemed as if the basic units of personality had been determined and the keystone in structure of modern social psychology had been found. That is why during the last few decades more attention has been paid to the study and measurement of attitudes than to any other topic or branch of social psychology. The word attitude is so deeply established in the vocabularies of both the scientist and the layman that it is impossible to get rid of it without defeating the purposes of communication. Attitudes are acquired and are the outcome of social learning and socialization. They are not observed or felt but they are inferred from words and actions of an individual. The different labels we apply to people such as communist, capitalist, Hindu, congressman, politician or businessman imply certain attitudes. Attitudes make a considerable difference in the life of almost everybody and our success and failure depend on our attitudes to our work and abilities, and we are anxious to create favourable attitudes in all those with whom we have to deal. During the last three-four decades extensive literature dealing with the formation, the change and measurement of social attitudes and the like has been published, and the attitudes of people toward religion, schools, political and economic programmes and policies, racial and national problems have been studied even experimentally. Their conclusions will be of great benefit to all students of social sciences and deserve close study.

The nature of attitudes

The term attitude has been defined in a variety of ways. According to Allport, 'An attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all

objects, and situations with which it is related.' Newcomb speaks of attitude as 'a state of readiness for motive arousal'; Sargent and Williamson think of an attitude 'as a fairly consistent learned tendency to behave in a certain way toward persons, objects or situation'. But almost all psychologists are agreed that an attitude is an organized and consistent manner of thinking, feeling and responding to social situations, people, groups, social issues and the like. It is made up mostly of thoughts and beliefs, feelings and tendencies or pre-dispositions to respond, and it is developed in the process of reacting and adjusting to our social environment. It is possible to determine essential characteristics of attitudes from these definitions.

An attitude denotes an adjustment of an individual toward a selected aspect of his environment or of his own conduct. When he regrets a line of conduct we say his attitude is one of remorse, when he refuses to join a party we speak of his unfavourable attitude. In assuming an attitude, the individual is ready to respond in a certain manner. An attitude is a state of readiness or predisposition to behave in a particular way toward an object or class of objects. This aspect that individuals have a state of readiness or preparation with which they meet their environment, is common to all definitions of attitude.

Attitudes are not behaviour but only predispositions to it. They affect behaviour and are a driving force leading the individual to action. It is attitudes that lead men to go on strike, to vote for a party or to contribute to the national war fund Attitudes function as motives, as has already been pointed out in a previous chapter, and have a feeling tone. Our emotions colour them.

Attitudes are not inherited and innate. They are learned and acquired in the course of experience. Some of them may be acquired from others but in any case they are learned. Our attitude to food is learned though hunger is a biogenic motive. Children of different parts of the country learn to like rice or wheat according as their parents use one or other type of food

Attitudes are more or less permanent. They last and endure No doubt in the course of experience they change, and we shall study in this chapter how they change, but this is true that they are more stable factors in behaviour. On their basis we can predict behaviour.

Attitudes are always goal directed either in a positive or a negative way. We speak of positive or negative attitudes according as they are favourable or unfavourable to the realization of a goal. An attitude is always for or against an object, person, situation or group, but the idea of a goal is implicit in all attitudes.

Lastly, attitudes are not directly known but indirectly inferred from actions and words. In any situation an individual's perceptions may release postural, glandular, and neural adjustments which then prepare the individual for some specific forms of responses. These adjustments we may call, for example, attitudes of affection, reverence, disgust or suspicion. These attitudes are known from changes in facial expression, in bodily posture, in hand and arm movements or in the direction of eye-fixation. But such gestures, postures or grimaces are not enough, for one thing they cannot be measured. Attitudes are also inferred from, or are best known through, verbal responses or opinions.

Attitudes are relatively enduring and persisting, they are essential components of personality and therefore, they tend to be organized into a system. This does not mean that there is no conflict or disharmony among various attitudes of a person but making allowances for contradictory elements, attitudes tend to be integrated into a whole system.

Attitudes and motives

The distinction between an attitude and a motive must be clearly understood. Attitudes refer to cognitive and affective states of the organism, how an individual understands and feels about another individual, group or issue. Motives refer to the dynamic or energising aspect of behaviour, they are drives with associated goals. They are constantly in operation and are springs of behaviour. Attitudes, on the other hand, are predispositions to specific types of behaviour towards objects, persons and groups. They are always there. But neither attitudes nor motives are directly observable, they are constructions or inferences based on the observation of consistencies in behaviour.

Roger Brown says that an attitude has a 'focus'. It may be a person, group, a nation, a product or an issue. A motive on the other hand has no such focus, it has a goal object, a class of

things, persons or circumstances. But because both are learned both are used to understand and characterize persons. We generally describe and interpret people in terms of their attitudes and motives. But while attitudes are more or less enduring predispositions, motives are responses learned to meet basic needs of the organism—hunger, thirst, sex. Survival and welfare of the organism depends on the satisfaction of these needs, and since these needs are satisfied in co-operation with other adult human beings, motives are learned in the course of social interaction.

Thus the strength of a motive will depend on a drive state and therefore, motives appear, disappear and re-appear. An attitude is not associated with any drive, it merely refers to the likelihood that a given kind of motive can be aroused. If motives are the mainsprings of behaviour, attitudes are very essential in the organization of that behaviour and will affect motives. A strong and persistent attitude of protection toward my daughter paves the way for such motives as providing good education for her, looking after her health and welfare, and leaving her a tidy sum in my will A strong civic attitude may induce me to participate, join and help all such movements and activities as will promote the sanitation and welfare of the town in which I live.

We have spoken of attitudes as enduring pre-dispositions but they may not be very stable under certain conditions such as a shocking experience.

Social attitudes

Each one of us has developed a number of attitudes in the course of his life and experience. Some of these attitudes are personal, others are social My attitude toward replying to letters, my mother, bus journeys, my college and so on may be quite peculiar to me and personal. Such attitudes are my private affair. But there are attitudes which I share with members of my group or even with a large number of people outside my group. They are *social attitudes.* My attitude to socialism, disarmament, mothers, economic planning, widow re-marriage, and the like may be shared by others in my country and even outside it. They are social attitudes and concern a large number of other individuals. Leaders in political life, in business and in administration must know how widely and

strongly these attitudes are held. Some of these attitudes are not given any importance. What is the attitude of people toward mothers, honesty, teachers, and railway property are not significant socially till there is a large-scale flouting of the authority of mothers by teenage girls, widespread corruption in all areas of work, frequent indiscipline and strikes in educational institutions and railway property is pilfered or damaged on a large scale. Social attitudes concern objects, situations, issues and problems known to members of a group or society, and their study and assessment is of some practical benefit to society in general.

Beliefs and opinions

Closely related to attitudes are beliefs and opinions. Beliefs are also widely held. Knowledge seems to be essential to belief, although we recognize that belief is more than knowledge. Belief also involves desire though all desires are not beliefs. I believe the earth to be round but I have no desire that it should be. Belief is also not related to action for one may believe and yet act differently from his beliefs. Beliefs involve judgement, an affirmation or denial of the validity of a proposition. It is the acceptance of some proposition or statement, and this acceptance is integrated into an affective process. Christians take off their hats during worship but Sikhs must cover their heads. These are beliefs and are accepted as true and valid by those who belong to that faith. They are not attitudes. People who hold such beliefs genuinely believe that there is some good rational basis for them and that they can be proved.

It has long been held that we believe what we wish to believe; in fact, some psychologists insist that reasons cited in support of beliefs are most frequently rationalizations of activities induced by emotion or desire. They therefore suggest that desire is a major determinant of belief.

An opinion resembles belief in so far as it involves acceptance of a proposition. But the holder of an opinion is less sure of his ground and does not hold it as strongly as he holds his belief. Opinions are vague and the individual only feels that they are correct. Like attitudes opinions may be favourable or unfavourable. Concerning some objects and situations we are not clear about what we should believe, there is a controversy,

and then what we hold is a mere opinion. Some writers refer to opinions as beliefs about controversial topics. Attitude refers to behaviour but opinion is symbolic and verbal. Opinion is a verbal response indicating the attitude of an individual, and that is why attitudes are measured by opinion statements Attitude scales sample opinions. That is why we speak of attitudes as inferred predispositions or tendencies which incline an individual to express opinions indicating varieties of belief such as acceptance, doubt or disbelief

The measurement of attitudes

Many different techniques have been devised for the study and measurement of attitudes and opinions, and there is a good deal of controversy about the possibility of measurement and the relative merits of the several techniques being used for the purpose. Perhaps the first thing is to determine what we want to measure and then determine the value of techniques used for that purpose.

Dimensions of attitudes

Atttiudes may be considered to have several dimensions or attributes which are important to the problem of measurement. They may be briefly described here.

Direction refers to the positive or negative, the 'like' or 'dislike' aspects of attitude. It is the extent to which an individual is for or against an object, person or event Are we for or against disarmament, girls playing football, family planning or aligning our country with one of the power blocs?

Degree refers to the extent or amount of favourableness or unfavourableness of an attitude. Do we favour the equality of women in all situations or do we wish to restrict this equality only to a few areas of life and work?

Intensity refers to the strength of feeling which may accompany an attitude. How strongly do we feel about equal rights for women? Degree and intensity of attitudes are related but it is possible to feel strongly about a situation without going far in the matter. Many people feel very strongly about equality of opportunities for women but would like to restrict it only to education, and not extend it to employment for instance.

Salience refers to the degree to which an attitude is given

prominence by its holder and the freedom with which he expresses his attitudes. How ready are we in giving vent to our attitudes! Many people have strong anti-feeling for the ruling party but are not ready to come out openly with their denunciation of the party. How quickly do we speak of our opposition even when we are not being questioned?

The *centrality* of an attitude means how close it is to the centre of a system of attitudes and values that are highly significant to the welfare and goals of the individual. Does it occupy a key position or is it merely a marginal attitude? Such attitudes as are strongly held are likely to be central, they may be supported by a set of beliefs.

There are perhaps some other attributes in which attitudes vary, but these five are very important. Not all of these attributes can be satisfactorily measured. Perhaps the first three are more easily measured than the remaining two.

Opinions

Opinions are verbal statements considered to be expressing attitudes. When individuals express opinions, their statements are assumed to reflect their positions on a scale which represents all degrees from a very favourable attitude to a very unfavourable attitude. A single opinion may provide very limited evidence about a person's attitude, or it may supply enough to fix his position on the scale accurately. When the opinion expressed takes an extreme view it is more helpful in placing him correctly than when it takes a middle view. On the basis of expressed opinions individual scales attempt to place individuals on a single continuum. Earlier scales did nothing more than collect statements related to the attitude being studied and subjects were asked to note their approval or disapproval of the statements made. Each item was scored in some rough-and-ready manner like giving -2 for strong disapproval, -1 for mild disapproval, 0 for no opinion, $+1$ for mild approval and $+2$ for strong approval, and then adding up the total for calculation. These methods were crude and unscientific and recently some very methodical attempts have been made at devising scaling techniques for the measurement of attitudes.

Criteria of opinion statements

How should the opinion statements be selected? What essentials must they fulfil before they can be used for attitude measurement?

In the first place the propositions must be stated in simple, clear and direct language. Their meaning must be grasped immediately. Ambiguous words and constructions, double negatives or statements commanding both agreement and disagreement, should be avoided.

Secondly, all statements should call for acceptance or rejection of issues. These issues should be open to debate. The statements should not be about matters of fact, because their aim is to discover about the general attitude of the individual toward an issue or institution and not his information. A statement like 'family planning is expensive' does not lead to an expression of attitude, as it is related to a fact which most people accept as unavoidable.

Thirdly, opinion statements should adequately express some aspect of our culture pattern which is under investigation They should be concerned with existing attitudes, attitudes which are prevailing at present, and not those of the past. Usually such statements are samples of agreement or rejection of a number of items, but they should be very carefully selected. Unless a fair sampling of possible opinions is provided no amount of care in administering measuring techniques will yield any valid conclusions.

Let us now discuss some of the scaling techniques put forward by social psychologists and sociologists.

Thurstone's scale of equal-appearing intervals

L. L. Thurstone and E. J. Chave developed a method of scale construction which is still being widely used. The first step, as in all methods, is to collect statements of opinion from a large number of people and examine them with a view to eliminate overlapping items. They are revised to meet the requirements of criteria laid down in the last section. The next step in the method of equal-appearing intervals is to list opinions in a graduated series ranging from the most favourable to the most unfavourable. For this purpose statements are printed on sli

of paper. A large number of experts are appointed as judges to sort out statements and assign them to eleven categories according to their degree of favourableness or unfavourableness. The judges are not to express their own opinion about the issue but only to arrange statements according to the position they represent. To make rating easy eleven slips are marked clearly with roman numerals from I to XI and placed in front of each judge. Of the eleven slips only three are labelled, the two extremes—the most favourable and the most unfavourable—and the sixth one is called neutral. Judges place every statement in one category or the other.

The main purpose of this rating scheme is to arrange in equal appearing intervals all the selected statements so that a scale resembling a footrule is constructed in which an item placed in category V is more favourable than another in category VI, and an item in category IV is more favourable than another in category V. Judges have instructions to attend to shifts in opinions rather than the labels placed before them. That is why they are given only three points, two extremes and one middle or neutral. For example if we take up the issue of the place of English in our national life we may collect hundreds of statements involving definite opinions from press cuttings, speeches, books, pamphlets, and the like from complete acceptance to complete rejection of English. The judges would be asked to sort out statements and place at one end the statement which makes a total acceptance and at the other end a statement which totally rejects it. In between there are placed nine categories, the sixth being neutral neither accepting nor rejecting English. Then the other statements will be classified from one end to the other according to their degree of acceptance or rejection of English. Because the scale represents an evenly graduated series of attitudes as there are in a footrule the method is called as one of equal-appearing intervals.

Then for every item we tabulate the number of times it is placed in each category, total these frequencies, find the cumulative proportions and put them in the eleven degrees of the attitude scale. Thurstone used about 300 judges but later investigations have shown that reliable evaluations are possible with a smaller number also. Some have employed from 25 to 100 judges.

One of the criticisms easily made with some degree of plausibility against this scaling technique is that scale values may reflect only the attitudes of judges who do the original rating and their personal attitude may affect their evaluation. If this criticism were valid, the scale will have no practical value. Thurstone assumed that those who are asked to evaluate the statements will not be affected by their own attitude. A number of investigators saw the possibility and set about verifying if Thurstone's assumption was found to be correct.

Hinckley took up 114 statements of opinion about the Negro and asked 3 groups to evaluate them independently. The first group of judges consisted of white students from the south who were very unfavourable to the Negro, the second group consisted of white students from the north who were prejudiced in favour of the Negro, and his third group consisted of Negro students The first two groups had 600 students and the third had 250 Negro students. These students arranged 114 statements into eleven categories. Hinckley constructed three scales on the basis of the evaluation of the three groups. Between the scale values of the white southern students who were very unfavourable to the Negro and the scale values of the favourable white northern group there was a correlation of .98 and between the former and the Negro group which was highly involved in the issue there was a correlation of .93 Thus all the three different groups gave practically the same evaluations for the various statements of opinion they were asked to judge. Therefore it is reasonable to conclude that the particular attitude of the judges who helped in scale construction did not affect the scale Other investigators like Ferguson who tried to construct a scale for measuring attitudes towards war, and Pinter and Forlano who devised a scale measuring patriotism reached the same conclusion, that the effect of bias or prejudice on judges in their evaluation of statements of opinion is almost negligible.

Nevertheless it does not mean that this highly mathematical device gives a very accurate measurement of attitudes At best these scales only describe opinions, and an individual's opinions do not show the high degree of organization which Thurstone and his followers assume. Another caution to be kept in view is that verbal response or opinion does not always represent the

whole attitude of the individual.

Likert's method of summated ratings

Likert's approach to construction of attitude scales is much different and simpler. It removes the need of employing judges for evaluation, but here too a large number of statements of opinion regarding a particular issue have to be collected. The statements are not submitted to judges for evaluation but are presented directly to subjects for recording their reactions by marking one of the words *strongly approve, approve, undecided, disapprove, strongly disapprove.* These phrases have been frequently modified depending on the nature of social attitudes to be studied. When statements of opinions are expressed in the form of question like *Do you like to meet strangers?* responses may be worded as *almost always, frequently, occasionally, rarely, almost never.* Some investigators use words *strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree,* and *strongly disagree* when statements call for agreement rather than approval. But these differences are not important. The reactions are given numerical values ranging from 5 to 1 or 1 to 5 respectively and then totalled for each individual to make the score. The neutral point always carries the score of three. Bird has called this method as one of summated ratings. The final step is to correlate each item with the total score and find out the amount of correlation. Such items as do not correlate satisfactorily are dropped.

Obviously this method is less cumbersome than that of Thurstone because it dispenses with the need of judges for evaluation. It does not involve so much labour. But Likert's method of summated ratings will need much more time to administer and then to score all responses of subjects.

One great advantage with the Likert's technique is that five-point judgement on each item is much more useful and informative than mere acceptance or rejection of an item. It indicates the intensity of opinion as well as its direction. Thurstone's scale does not serve this double purpose.

The Bogardus social distance scale

Bogardus did pioneer work in devising a technique for measuring attitudes toward nationalities, particularly for measur-

ing tolerance of out-groups. On this scale the individual is asked to indicate the extent of his willingness to accept members of different racial groups into various social institutions. The instructions for the scale are: 'According to my first feeling reactions I would willingly admit members of each race (as a class, and not the best I have known, nor the worst members) to one or more of the classifications under which I have placed a cross.' Seven classifications are offered for each nationality to be measured.

i) to close kinship by marriage;
ii) to club as my personal chums,
iii) to my street as my neighbours;
iv) to employment in my occupation;
v) to citizenship in my country;
vi) as visitor only in my country;
vii) would exclude from my country.

The classification moves in an orderly manner implying progressive proximity of relationship with the out-group At one end there is an extremely close kinship and at the other a very remote relationship. The use of this scale has been helpful in measuring the acceptance of different racial groups by various cultural groups.

In our country this social distance scale would be very useful because here we have a hierarchy of castes and sub-castes with some of whom we do not even sit, with others we sit but do not eat and with still others we eat but do not intermarry. There are servants who cannot enter the kitchen, servants who may enter the kitchen only to wash dishes but not to cook, and servants who may cook but will not polish shoes Thus varying degrees of social distance are found in Indian society. Harijans are being given equal civic and social rights but in rural communities tradition still rules supreme and though they are no longer untouchables in the literal sense they cannot draw water from the well of caste Hindus or worship at the same temple.

The Guttman technique of scale construction

K. Young observes that Likert's technique and Thurstone's scaling suffer from a common weakness. 'Both allow two individuals to get the same rank while exhibiting very different patterns of response. For example, an individual who responded very favourably on two items and very unfavourably on two others might achieve the same rank as one who took a moderate position on all four. Since the notion of attitude involves the assumption of regularity of response, different patterns of regularity should yield different ranks. Neither Thurstone nor Likert provides any procedure for evaluating response-regularity; therefore, neither is capable of demonstrating the presence of an attitude. This being the case, individual measurements are non-comparable, and rank positions are arbitrary. They lack descriptive meaning.'*

Louis Guttman of the Research Branch of the Information and Education Division of the War Department developed a technique for the measurement of attitudes which tries to solve the above problem. Though his technique is not quite perfect it is being widely used. Instead of obtaining answers of questions of opinions in the form of 'for' or 'against' answer, Guttman seeks to determine first whether the attitude is 'scalable' or not, that is, a sufficiently large part of the population being measured responds to the scale items in a consistent way. Consistency means that those who support a given item also support all other items which are less extreme and reject those which are more extreme. It is then meaningful to arrange people along a single continuum, from extreme 'for' to extreme 'against' positions. Both the items and the individuals can be placed in a rank order. The order of the items is the same as the order of their popularities.

Let us take an example of a questionnaire about height. The items might be: (1) Mohan is taller than the table, (2) Mohan is more than 4.5 feet tall, and (3) Mohan is as tall as 5 feet. In such a very simple case there will be no room for inconsistency and it would be a perfect example of the Guttman scale. This means that the set of items in the scale will be in the nature of very slight variations on the same subject. It is just

* *Handbook of Social Psychology*, p. 454.

rephrasing of the same thing This means that all attitude scales depend on asking a number of similar or closely related questions about the same thing Guttman has tried to construct an attitude scale on which individuals show only consistent responses but the experience of investigators is that even on best scales individuals show themselves to have somewhat inconsistent attitudes.

Some applications of attitude scales

The measurement of attitudes has attracted wide attention both within the field of social psychology and among laymen as well. It has great significance for shedding light on social problems and for reinterpreting the psychological nature of belief. Both research and applied workers have been impressed by the attempts of the social scientists to quantify this aspect of human behaviour and to define and describe the orientations of people toward each other, issues and institutions, for it opens out new channels of controlling belief and loyalties. There are four broad areas in which attitude-measurement has proved useful.

In the first place attitude measurement has helped research workers with methods of determining the stability of attitudes and of measuring the modification of attitudes as a result of certain influence of both education and propaganda Scales have been used to assess attitudes before and after the use of these influences. An inquiry into social conformity has revealed a number of factors like the influence of parents, religion, education, the standard of academic achievement, sex related to the formation of radical and reactionary attitudes. If attitudes are predispositions toward people, issues, and institutions, then it is important to know what social conditions, and what characteristics of personalities help their growth, development and decline.

Secondly, surveys of attitudes and opinions have been used by businessmen to find out in advance what the nature and amount of acceptance of a particular commodity by the public will be. When any business organization designs and manufactures a new product it takes a financial risk, and must ensure its purchase and consumption If it can know in advance what the reactions of the consuming public will be, what style and d

sign of packing will appeal, and how much the public is willing to pay for the product, it can plan the production and distribution of the commodity with greater confidence. It may avoid regions where it is not likely to be accepted and concentrate on those parts of the country where people will take to it with enthusiasm. Of course big business always knows after the sale where their products are favoured, but if they could know beforehand if any geographical region or cultural group favours or rejects their product they would be saved a lot of expense on publicity and distribution. Attitude scales may also help to determine the attitudes of employees toward their employers, their bosses and the like, and thus help mutual understanding and cordial relations between different sections of people employed in an industrial plant.

Thirdly, attitude scales and measurement has helped vocational guidance and counselling immensely. People successful in particular vocational families have many interests and attitudes in common, these attitudes are characteristic of the vocational group and are not common to other vocational groups. Having examined the pattern of vocational interests and attitudes of various vocational groups, subjects are tested on the same attitude scale and their score is compared with the score of the various vocational groups. Such comparisons will be of great help in vocational guidance.

Lastly, they help in public opinion surveys, in tracing nationality preferences, in determining how our system of education is affecting such preferences and ultimately in ensuring mutual understanding and co-operation among people. Such antipathies as are revealed can be neutralized before they are made more rigid leading to conflict.

Development of attitudes

We have considered some attempts at measuring attitudes. Another important question is how attitudes develop and become what they are, how they are formed and how they persist.

The most important factor in the formation and development of attitudes is the cultural pattern of the institution and the groups. We have already seen that culture consists of the customs, traditions, attitudes and beliefs people have about

important aspects of life, and they influence each individual through a large variety of influences such as the family, the school, the neighbourhood, social groups and the like. These influences work together and it is difficult to distinguish between their effects separately. For example one can compare the rigidity of thinking and behaving in a totalitarian society with the freedom and elasticity in the ways of people living in a democratic set-up. Such rigidity is also found in social groups extremely orthodox and custom-bound. And within these two extremes there are several shades of variations The Chinese have protested several times against statements made by Indians in direct contradiction of the approach of the Indian government. They do not understand and appreciate that ours is a free country where every citizen is free to express his opinions, however unpalatable to the governments at home and abroad. Freedom of thought and expression in India, U S A and U K. often takes people from totalitarian regimes by surprise

Even among democracies there are sharp differences in the attitudes of people depending upon their differing social heritage The swagger of the American, the reserve of the Englishman, and the informal friendliness of the Indian reflect differences of cultural framework It is difficult to trace particular attitudes to specific types of culture patterns because there are for ever numerous factors bearing upon attitudes

In every culture there is a distinct pattern of child upbringing and education both in the home and the school, and parents and teachers are inculcating attitudes among young ones in their charge Some sort of indoctrination is inevitable under any system of training And the peer group also matters The games we play, the books we read, the type of people we commend and condemn, the numerous identifications encouraged in the school and the home, the nature and kind of entertainment, the radio and the church, all contribute to the formation of attitudes. In some homes children are encouraged to see films, to read magazines, to play indoor games, to stage short plays and the like. Their attitudes will be different from those who are not allowed to have any of these experiences When children grow up they become Hindus, Christians, or Muslims, and this makes a difference to their attitudes Being a Boy Scout

or Girl Guide affects attitudes.

Numerous studies have been made regarding the effect of different cultural influences on the attitudes of a person, and definite correlations have been obtained between attitudes and culture patterns, between the attitudes of parents and teachers and the attitudes of children. In America many investigations have shown that attitudes toward other races and prejudices toward Negroes are particularly influenced by the attitude of parents.

But culture alone cannot explain all the attitudes a person develops. For one thing he is not a passive recipient of cultural influences. He has a personality of his own which is an important factor in determining his attitudes. There are some influences to which he falls a ready victim and there are other influences which do not have any effect on him. Some studies have attempted to correlate personality traits with attitudes, and they endorse the fact that some traits favour the formation of specific attitudes while others oppose them. But the interfering factors of culture may prove stronger and personality traits which go with one type of attitudes in one culture may not lead to such attitudes in another culture.

Again some people have a strong loyalty to their class or group and are easily moved by the norms of that class or group. Their sense of belongingness is so strong that they readily acquire the attitudes common to members of that class or group. Others do care and are influenced by ways and norms foreign to their class or group.

Attitudes once developed tend to persist and preserve themselves, and do not change readily. It is because, in the first place, there are social pressures against changing attitudes so readily. Everyone is anxious to seek social approval and maintains consistent attitudes. Second, attitudes determine and select what we perceive and remember and only those facts are emphasized which fit in with our attitudes. Third, we tend to withdraw from situations and persons which involve attitudes opposite to ours. We do not read magazines and books which preach attitudes different from ours. Thus attitudes perpetuate themselves.

Change in attitudes

Attitudes are an enduring and stable aspect of human personality, but since society and culture are constantly changing, attitudes too are subject to change and they are being constantly formed and reformed. In fact all social change and reconstruction turns on the change and reconstruction of attitudes. Secondly, attitude measurement is not an end in itself, it provides information regarding motives, of individuals or groups in situations to help social planners and reformers to understand the dynamics of human behaviour, and to direct and control deliberate changes.

Attitudes are formed through experience, and in spite of their stability can be changed through experience All around us a large number of events are deliberately arranged to influence our opinions and the way we behave. Newspapers are drawing our attention to social or political grievances in the hope of persuading us to action; advertisements are trying to change our attitudes to things and ways of living; official and unofficial leaders through speeches and statements are persuading us to oppose or support new legislations, our votes and opinions are sought to be influenced through reasoning or appeal to our prejudices and sentiments; social reformers are trying to influence us to change our age old ways of thinking and behaving; religious leaders are for ever trying to wean us away from selfish ways and designs toward more altruistic thought and behaviour All of them are aiming at our beliefs and actions, at our attitudes, and trying to induce us to change our behaviour

Some of our beliefs and attitudes are held sacred by us and we stick to them despite pressures, but some we do change We all believe that in our attitudes there are certain aspects and elements which can be changed with tact and right approach

Modern propaganda machine is very powerful and the mass media of the newspaper, radio, cinema and television are not only effective in revealing to us the attitudes of people but also helpful in shaping or changing the attitudes of people Persuading others to certain forms of thinking and behaving is an index of the success of the communicator in all spheres of life

Persuasion has one of the three objects. to create an attitude, to change the signs of an existing attitude or to increase the intensity of an already existing attitude. In wishing to create a favourable attitude toward some object or class of objects the

communicator appeals to the values and ideals held dear by the audience. In trying to change an attitude from negative to positive and vice versa he would discredit the beliefs supporting the attitude he wishes to change. And in strengthening and intensifying the existing attitude, he would increase the value and importance of that attitude, he would commend the beliefs and values on which it is based. The crusader for family planning tries to build among people a fear complex for economic hardships resulting from large and unmanageable families, his primary effort is to create an attitude unfavourable to large families and favourable to one or two children. If he finds people hostile, he may remind them about their sacred duty to provide all amenities and comforts for their children, the hard times of soaring prices and the bright prospect of good and happy living for themselves and their one or two children. If they are already favourably inclined he may cite the example of other countries where people with some families resulting from family planning have been able to raise their standard of living very substantially. Pointed references to the risk to life and the strain on family budget due to frequent maternities may help to create new attitudes and change the old ones.

During the last two decades India has known many social changes as a result of which radical changes in the attitudes of individuals have taken place. Our attitude to Harijans, other communities, family planning, position of women, employment of women, and scores of other social situations and issues have changed considerably under the impact of powerful propaganda through press, speeches, demonstrations, programmes of institutions, examples of leaders and their mass contacts. But the dynamics of social change has not been studied systematically and only a few studies have been made in this direction. We may discuss two important methods of attitude change and postpone the discussion of propaganda to a separate chapter.

The first method of inducing changes in attitudes is to expose individuals to such external influences as education and propaganda and then study the changes which have come about in individuals. The plan of investigation is that an attitude test is given to a group of individuals and their attitudes towards a specific issue are assessed. Then the group is subjected to a series of influences for some time and afterwards they are tested

again to check up for any change in their attitudes. Such a method will be found useful in reorientating groups or classes with regard to some issue. For example, if they are faced with the problem of reclaiming a criminal tribe, we may give them attitude tests, and then through a programme of re-education in which films are shown that crime does not pay, lectures are given that there is a better way of life, schools are started for their children, efforts are made to give them vocational training, they are persuaded to change their way of life. Obviously this programme shall have to be carried on for some time and intensified for a small community. Later they are given tests to find out if there has been any change in their attitudes.

Another technique is to place the individual in such a social setting that he has rich opportunities to interact and enter into give-and-take relations with other individuals. This technique is more effective. One of the most impressive investigations of attitude change is Newcomb's Bennington study. Bennington College is a small women's college in the United States with about 250 students, and is situated in an out-of-the-way place. One of the ideals of this college is to inculcate liberal views on matters social and economic. As students are drawn from well-to-do families their attitudes are mostly conservative. Leadership and prestige went to students with liberal views. When at the conclusion of the course the attitudes of students were tested there was a marked change. This change Newcomb attributes to the social climate prevailing in the college. For students the college community had become the *reference-group*, and anxious to belong to that community and through constant interaction with them, they imbibed the attitudes prevalent in the community.

Group discussion

The process of group discussion and thinking is a conscious effort of a community of individuals to think and decide co-operatively on any issue. It may be used with considerable effect for changing and reconstructing attitudes. Along with our large-scale plans for industrial and social change and advancement the Indian government are for ever organizing seminars, summer camps, study groups, group discussions, conferences and

the like, to give people of different shades of opinions to express themselves and reconstruct their opinions in the light of other people's views. Many teachers return from such meets with a changed outlook. Kurt Lewin used group discussion for experimental investigation. During World War II it was used to bring about a change in the food habits of people. Some types of food though of great nutritional value were not popular with Americans. Lewin made his experiments with six Red Cross groups of volunteers, each group consisting of 13 to 17 individuals. Three groups were subjected to the 'lecture method' and three to the 'discussion method', and for both the time given was 45 minutes. In the former three lectures were given on the value of these foods, how useful, handy, and economical they were and how they would help to save meat for the army. Recipes to prepare these foods were distributed. In the latter three groups the problem was brought in for free discussion and every individual participated in it. They discussed how the foods could be made more popular and what could be the possible objections to it. Later, all individuals were checked in order to find out how many were actually using the new foods. It was found that only 3 per cent of the former and 32 per cent of the latter set of groups had included those foods in their diet. It showed that the discussion method was far more effective in changing attitudes than the lecture method though it did not go far and could influence only one-third of the individuals. There is however, no doubt that participation in group discussion helps to overcome resistance and accept changes.

But in all such techniques several factors are involved such as emotional appeal, cultural background, intellectual standards of participants, ego-involvements and the like.

Consistency in attitudes

We have mentioned consistency as a dimension of all attitudes but this does not mean that we over-emphasize man's rationality and claim that man is always consistent in his thought and behaviour, in his attitudes, beliefs, opinions or values. All that is meant is that he strives to be consistent and to avoid inconsistency, incongruity and imbalance.

There may be two different kinds of consistency. First, there is consistency within the structure of a single attitude. Second, there is consistency between attitudes.

The trend toward consistency within the framework of a single attitude is obvious enough. The components of an attitude are all tied to the same object, the object or the situation of an attitude has to be dealt with in the same fashion most of the time and we all do make predictions about the behaviour of an individual on the basis of past evidence of his attitude Mr. Sharma will not donate for the Harijan uplift because he belongs to the hard core of the orthodox die-hard Hindu section.

Again people strive to maintain some degree of consistency in their views of themselves and their environment, as well as in their relations with others. Some times they do and say things which look irrational or illogical but which, when examined closely, turn out to be quite consistent with their past behaviour and their desire to maintain symmetry, consonance and balance among the various elements of their lives.

This fact has been made the basis of an important theory put forward by L Festinger known as the *Cognitive Dissonance Theory*. He assumes that the individual attempts to establish internal harmony, consistency or congruity among his opinions, attitudes, beliefs, knowledge and values which he calls "cognitive elements". He holds that these cognitive elements may be irrelevant when they have nothing to do with each other, are consonant if one element falls in line with the other, and are dissonant when the two are obverse of each other. He believes that the presence of dissonance leads to pressure to reduce the dissonance, the amount of pressure depends on the amount of dissonance, and that dissonance functions like a drive, need or tension. Its presence leads to action just as the presence of hunger leads to action to remove hunger. Dissonance may be resolved by changing one of the cognitive elements, by adding new elements or by decreasing the importance of elements. Dissonance is most likely to be created when individuals make a free choice.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

ROHRER and SHERIF. *Social Psychology at the Crossroads* (New York: Harper & Brothers).

LINDZEY, G *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 2 vols. (Addison Wesley Publishing Co.).

ALLPORT, G. W. *Personality, A Psychological Interpretation* (New York: Henry Holt & Co.).

BIRD, C. *Social Psychology* (New York: D Appleton-Century Co.).

SHERIF and SHERIF. *An Outline of Social Psychology* (New York: Harper & Brothers).

NEWCOMB, T. M. *Social Psychology* (London: Tavistock Publishers Ltd.).

YOUNG, K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.).

CHAPTER XI

PUBLIC OPINION

TODAY PUBLIC opinion is a very powerful factor in regulating and controlling public life. With the decay and disappearance of monarchies and feudalism and with the emergence of democratic forms of government all over the world public opinion is a great social force to be reckoned with. That is why statesmen, demagogues, and social scientists, are greatly interested in the nature and function of public opinion, its psychological characteristics and measurement. Recently in India public opinion has compelled the government to take several anti-corruption measures. The press, the radio, the movie and other media of mass communication have lately helped to form, strengthen and crystallize public opinion.

The nature of public opinion

We all seem to know what is public opinion but our difficulties arise when we are called upon to give an accurate definition of it Some social psychologists and sociologists rest content with a circular definition that public opinion is the opinion of the public, others emphasize in their definitions the people's general attitudes on issues of vital importance to the community as a whole, and still others consider the term 'public' more important and underscore the element of rational discussion prevailing in a self-conscious community and the collective judgements on important issues and problems which arise out of that discussion. Instead of offering a pithy definition let us try to analyse some of the important characteristics of public opinion.

The first step is to be clear about the term *public*. Crowd is a large number of people assembled together but the term public implies a community of people, big or small, who have common interests and values. The public is a psychological group with-

out any face-to-face contact. These groups may be of varying sizes, interests, and values. We speak of world opinion, that is, opinion of the world as a whole concerning matters which affect the entire human race, and we speak of the racing public, mercantile public, the public of Lucknow, or the British public. Not only do the members of any public have common interests but they are also conscious of this fact. In other words, they form a self-conscious group.

But though members of a public have a common concern or face a common issue, they may have wide differences in other matters like occupation, residence, mode of living, dress, education and what not. The term public is fairly inclusive in the sense that it may include many groups like members of a family, trade union, club, association, or profession. They may all be reacting to a common social stimulus situation, some matter of common interest or concern or some common problem or issue.

Obviously public opinion is the outcome of social interaction involving discussion and agreement. That is why some social psychologists emphasize that public opinion involves disagreement, discussion and consequent formation of a more or less common standpoint with regard to an issue. The mere prescence of a problem does not mean that there is a public opinion about it. A town may be very insanitary affecting the health of the people of that town and yet there may be no public opinion about it because the people are not conscious of their health needs and have never thought about the question. Public opinion arises when they raise the issue, discuss it in groups and begin to take a common stand about it. This, however, does not imply any unanimity of opinion. Some people may have different ideas, but they all begin to be exercised about it. There would be no public opinion if a large number of people were to say that they had never thought about it.

Public opinion presupposes that members are in touch with each other through one or the other means of communication. In smaller compact communities such contacts may be personal and face-to-face, and in larger groups of a nation or country, newspapers, radio, or touring publicity agents may help to mobilize public opinion. People who are not known to each other or who are removed from each other by long distances are

brought together through newspapers, radio, and mass contacts through leaders. If members are organized round some institution, programme, ideology, and the like the public and its opinion becomes more effective.

Obviously individual participation in public opinion will vary. Many individuals may not agree to the public opinion, many may have opposite opinion in private and yet in public may subscribe to the opinion generally held. On some question an individual may be undecided, and he does not drop out of the public on that account. The degree of participation may change from issue to issue though the public does not.

Public opinion means all the opinions maintained by various parts of the public in question as well as those parts which have not made up their mind about the question. Usually public opinion is spoken of in the singular because it implies one dominant opinion. Such an opinion may not be necessarily the opinion of the majority Often the opinion of a powerful minority is more effective.

The public is characterized by discussion and argument. The movie public is for ever discussing as to which is the best picture of the year, who is the best film star or music director. There is nothing like agreement on these issues which face them. In fact what distinguishes a public from a crowd is its dependence on the processes of deliberation. Through letters to the press, speeches at meetings or even on the roadside and in parks important issues are debated upon, controversies are raised and opinions crystallize.

What is a public

It must have already become clear to readers what a public is, but since in modern times public opinion plays so vital a role it would be worthwhile bringing out the nature of a public in detail. A public is not a crowd, for a crowd is a physically assembled gathering of people and does not imply physical personal contact. There is no crowd feeling and people are less suggestible. That is why members of a public do not lose their individuality as members of a crowd do.

Because of face-to-face contact involved in a crowd a person can be a member of only one crowd but he may belong to a

number of publics. He may belong to the public of Delhi, to the movie public in criticizing and appreciating new pictures and actresses, to sporting public in judging selections for the olympic team, or to the reading public in appraising a new book. Publics depend on means of communication and through the several media one may participate in several groups without being physically present with them.

In our own times media of communication are quick and numerous. Time and space have been conquered, and consequently the range of interest is widened. We are more world-minded today than we were ever so before. In matters of sport, peace, disarmament, food shortage, education, scientific development, dress and what not we are concerned with what is happening in other parts of the world and the country, and we belong to several publics. We are associated with several institutions and organizations and discuss their programmes and policies.

The public is far more influential than a crowd. It is less suggestible, more rational and more powerful. Modern states cannot but bow to what the public demands. Every political organization is for ever feeling the pulse of the public and is greatly sensitive to its opinions. Therefore modern leaders are very anxious to control public opinion and direct it into channels which suit them. Congress leadership during the last decade has been trying its level best to divert public attention from corruption to the need of discipline, but recently the public asserted itself so strongly that the government was compelled to yield.

A public may be a group of any size but members must be conscious of common interests. Its members interact and intercommunicate, they discuss issues and arrive at definite conclusions, .there is room for disagreement but they have common social values and are capable of forging a common standpoint on issues confronting them.

What is an opinion

An opinion, according to common usage, is a 'judgement or belief based on grounds short of proof, provisional conviction' founded on probable evidence. There are several kinds of beliefs, some are held with conviction because of the authority on

which they are based, and some are based on true knowledge. But there are other beliefs which concern about a controversial issue, and these are opinions. Opinions arise when our reactions to an issue have to be varied. Take for example the problem of family planning. Some of us may go all out for it, others may express themselves totally against it, still others may wish the programme to be postponed till people are better or more educated. These are opinions.

An opinion is not a sentiment for a sentiment is an emotional disposition related to some object or situation. There is nothing controversial about the object of a sentiment while an opinion *involves an element of controversy.*

The distinction between an attitude and an opinion is sometimes indicated by saying that the former is a tendency to act and behave and the latter is a verbal *expression of it.* And sometimes the enduring and lasting character of attitudes is contrasted with the variable and transient character of opinions. The former approach will place opinions as verbal counterparts or expressions of attitudes while the latter will define opinions *as less significant than attitudes The relation is not* very accurately defined and the distinction seems to be arbitrary.

Public opinion and culture

The growth of public opinion is relative to culture Modern society is very complex and complicated, and there is a great deal of specialization There are several institutions and groups concerning themselves with specific purposes and areas of work That is why we speak of many types of publics and *spheres* of public opinion Controversies are for ever raging over several issues in various areas of life and work and public opinion is formed and re-formed. But *in primitive societies* where education is not widespread and where most of the issues are decided by reference to folkways and mores, there is much less difference *of opinion and therefore* public opinion is either non-existent or very feeble. Rigid customs and traditions determine controversial issues.

Distinction may also be made between rural and urban communities. The latter are more self-conscious, deliberative and public-minded. Interaction through press and radio is greater

and there is greater concern about state and national matters. Rural communities are concerned more with local situations, there is face-to-face contact and they deal with issues by assembling together and thrashing out details of problems as they arise.

Formation of public opinion

Public opinion arises from public discussion of a problem affecting the interests and values of the people. Kimball Young refers to four steps in the information of public opinion. In the first place there is always some issue or problem about which the public mind is exercised. Some individuals or groups identify the problem and seek a solution. There is an abnormal rise in food prices, a physical catastrophe or a border violation, and some sections of the community voice the feeling that the government has failed to come up to the expectations of the public or protect what the people feel about their rights and privileges. There may be some letters to the press, a meeting of some one group or some agitation is worked up through processions. This is the first stage when public attention is drawn to the problem.

In the second stage the extent and intensity of the problem is explored and assessed. How serious is the problem? How can it be solved? What steps should be taken to solve it and when? Meetings, processions, letters to newspapers and statements by leaders help to bring out the several aspects of the issue as also to suggest and crystallize the issue. Individuals and groups may give close attention to the issue and set about studying it. Experts may also be called in. Newspapers and broadcasting organizations may give the issue greater coverage to focus public attention and thinking and committees of responsible persons may be appointed by both the government and the public organisations to study the question and suggest remedial measures.

In the third stage alternative solutions to the problem come up, sides are taken, controversies are raised. There may be agitation in favour of one type of solution. Often passions run high and a partisan spirit may endanger public peace. Leaders help mobilize both public opinion and agitation. Often the approach of the different parties is not quite rational and the desire to censure the government gets the better of public interest and

the interest and prestige of the party is preferred to the interest of the country and the nation.

In the fourth stage talk, meetings, press, letters and reviews, processions and debates have had their day and there is strong case for decision. Different parties or the majority party arrives at some sort of a decision for action. Such a decision rests on concensus of opinion and may not be based on complete agreement. It may be the decision of the majority party and other minorities accept it. Then legislation follows and though everybody has to obey laws, rules or orders passed, minority groups may continue to agitate and press for the change and modification of the laws and orders Usually action follows the decisions made.

This general outline of the process of the formation of public opinion may vary in a large number of ways depending upon the specific character of the social situations.

From the above it should be obvious that public opinion is not the unanimous will of the people. The nature of opinion is *such that an element of doubt marks it off from belief, and in the* case of public opinion it may safely be asserted that some sort of disagreement is necessary for its growth and development. In fact if there were complete unanimity there would be no need of public opinion. Public opinion grows against a background of conflict and controversy, and of the several opinions that prevail the one that is accepted is that which predominates. 'This predominance does not imply unanimity: certainly if unanimity is insisted upon, then the sphere of public opinion must be very restricted.' *

The importance of public opinion

Public opinion is an effective means of social control; public approval and disapproval serves to regulate human behaviour as no other political agency does. True it is that there have been *numerous instances* in history of the apathy, ignorance and brutal fanaticism of the masses, but still the control cannot be dispensed with for it is a good check on the designs of those who wield power in society. In *Ramayana* even Ram had to bow to the will of the people in banishing his wife and the tradi-

* Ross, *The Psychology of Society*, p. 140.

and maintain their independence, integrity, and respectability, and not be the handmaiden of any political party or the government. Another factor contributing to their popularity and power is the growing literacy among the masses. With the spread of democratic ideas and institutions programmes of universal, compulsory and free education began to be formulated. Newspapers became popular and helped to crystallize public opinion.

The modern newspaper is well within the reach of the common man. It is cheap, cheaper than the radio and the cinema seat. Advertisements make them cheap and some of the vernacular newspapers cost less than ten paise.

The press is the bulwark of democracy, and freedom has no meaning without freedom of association, freedom of speech and freedom of the press. The press is a sound mentor of public opinion and plays a vital and important role in exposing the wrong, fairly and fearlessly, and defend the right. Newspapers claim high moral standards and have often carried on a ceaseless crusading campaign against social evils and for decency and cleanliness in public life. Many journalists have died fighting rather than give up what they believe to be right and just. Of course in every country there are black sheep who deviate from social morality and indulge in 'yellow journalism', but they are generally disowned by the respectable section of newspapers. The press, therefore, is a power for healthy and beneficent social control.

On the other hand it is argued, not without justification, that the press has some dangerous trends. In the first place newspapers are owned by capitalists, draw their income mostly from industrialists in the form of payment for advertisements, and tend to defend all that capitalistic society stands for. Charge is frequently made that public interest is very often sacrificed to defend and protect individual interests, that radical opinions are suppressed, and that advocates of socialism and reform are persecuted. The slant in the expression and propagation of opinions and views is in favour of the privileged class, and even the selection of news is determined by their interests. In many free countries newspapers are controlled by a few individuals and they control their contents and policies. Thus they are able to direct and control public opinion in their own interests.

Secondly, it is argued that newspapers by giving undue promi-

nence to sensational crime stories and news appeal to the baser aspects of human nature and thus lower public taste and morality. Most of them are very keen to increase their circulation and have to cater to the tastes and passions of the general masses, and often give a very wrong picture of the national life. Divorce, scandals, daring robberies and the like find greater and more important space than lectures, exhibitions or discussions.

United States have about 1,800 newspapers with a population of about 183 millions and India has only 530 with a population of 450 millions. Maharashtra leads with 114 If they are an index of national prosperity and enlightenment our country has a long way to go In a developing country like ours newspapers have a vital and powerful role to play in disseminating knowledge and information and moulding public opinion. But they also express the worth and vitality of the language in which they are published as also make a significant contribution to the growth of that language Of the 530 newspapers published in India 142 are in Hindi, 64 in Urdu, 54 in English and 41 Marathi with a circulation of 7.64, 2.60, 14 52 and 5 36 lakhs respectively. In U.S.A. many newspapers exceed these figures singly.

Besides newspapers there are magazines and journals of many kinds, for the general readers as also for the specialists, and with varying circulations. Some have very limited editions. In U.S A. the *Readers' Digest* alone has a circulation of 140 lakhs

Then there are numerous government publications giving facts and figures and explaining the various state policies and programmes.

Usually newspapers contain three broad items—news, editorials and advertisement. News give facts, editorials express opinions, and advertisements seek to sell goods through slogans, picturesque language, illustrations and catchwords News may be inserted prominently in headlines or in any attractive way at the back page. The selection of news and the degree of prominence given to them itself creates a bias among readers, and then many people just scan the headlines and finish with their daily paper. Editorials have definite views to project and they are generally directed by the owners of newspapers. Most of the readers who are keenly interested in public affairs generally adopt the views of the paper they read daily. The role of news papers in propagating views is very powerful and many times

newspapers through slogans, selection of news, editorials, photographs, reports, letters to the editor and articles create the impression that the issue is very urgent, the public is greatly exercised about it and there is a crisis which the state must tackle without loss of time. That newspapers can create such illusions of universality to meet their own ends demonstrates that newspaper publicity in the hands of the unscrupulous may twist public opinion.

In India too many newspapers are published from more than one town. *The Times of India, The Indian Express* and *The Statesman* have different editions for different parts of the country. These give prominence to news and views concerned those parts. Not only do papers carry out the policies of their owners but they cannot also publish anything which may offend their usual advertisers. To this extent their policies are controlled by those who pay for their existence and upkeep. The dailies mentioned above have large resources, their revenues from circulation and advertisement being substantial, are therefore not influenced by the pleasure of any party or group of people.

It is interesting to note that Indian newspapers give a large coverage to speeches of ministers who believe that their importance depends on the space they are able to monopolize in the newspapers. Some newspapers have their heroes or pets in public life and use every occasion to boost them. It is hoped that with the spread of education and growth in political maturity newspapers will improve both in quality and quantity.

Radio

In our own times radio has been another very important medium of mass communication. The radio was used first to transmit important news to key officials in Europe and America in the First Great War but today every country is using it as a medium of information, entertainment and propaganda. In India radio stations and radio sets are on the increase. There are 28 radio stations in India, covering all the important linguistic areas, as against 6 in 1947. There were 284,000 receiver sets in 1948 and 1,581,947 in 1960. In U.S.A. there are 573 million TV sets and 1,700 million radio sets. Radio receivers are becoming cheaper in India and more and more people are using them. Community sets are provided in parks and other public

places providing free programmes to the poor.

Radio broadcasting is rigidly controlled in several totalitarian countries like Russia and China, and all programmes have to be approved by the government In countries like the United States of America radio broadcasting is as free as printing a newspaper and private individuals or organizations can start radio broadcasting stations after obtaining the necessary licence. There are four major networks: ABC—American Broadcasting Company, CBC—Columbia Broadcasting Company, MBS—Mutual Broadcasting System, and NBC—National Broadcasting Company, and there are 3,955 stations and 668 TV stations. In Great Britain and Canada corporations organize programmes and the State only supervises, while in India broadcasting is controlled by the State.

In India the major problem is to provide information, knowledge and entertainment to people A large mass of our people lives in rural areas and are uneducated and illiterate. They have to be persuaded to listen, and rural programmes are a large part of the broadcasting in India. They are both entertaining and useful, and are timed for the evening when village people are free. The evening time is regulated by the sunset rather than the clock and differs from season to season Rural broadcasting is listened to even by urban people if not for anything else, at least to bring them back to rural dialects and scenes.

Most listeners in India tune in for entertainment and nearly half the time is devoted to broadcasting music and drama Housewives tune in while doing their household work and students while reading. There are lunch and dinner-hour programmes, and special programmes for factory workers and soldiers. News are broadcast several times during the day and in many different languages, and what is distinctive about All-India Radio news service is that the news are given without any comments Headlines are given both in the beginning and the end of the news service. This helps both understanding and retention This objective approach is consistent with our democratic ideals

In all countries people like light and sentimental music Classical music is not popular and is liked by the select few Some time back, All-India Radio tried to cut down film music and replaced it by light classical music. The result was that people switched over to Radio Ceylon and Pakistan Radio. So AIR had

to revise its policy and programmes. Most of the listeners are young adolescents and they prefer light love songs to classical tunes which require training before they can be appreciated and enjoyed.

Another very popular feature is the cricket commentary. Thousands group round shops in the lunch hour to listen to cricket scores. If commentaries are carefully made they can help listeners to reconstruct in their imagination what is happening in the playground.

The radio has overcome the limitations of time and space and within minutes of any occurrence the news can be spread far and wide. Recently the death of our Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, was broadcast to the nation and within minutes even the remotest parts came to know about it.

Social scientists have tried to inquire into the relative strength of radio and newspapers in the determination of public opinion. A study made in Erie County, Ohio, in 1940, revealed that those who listened most to radio also ranked highest in time spent in reading newspapers. When asked as to which medium, the radio or the newspapers, helped them to take a decision, 68 per cent mentioned the radio and 66 per cent the newspaper. When asked about the most important source the radio held a clear lead. This was attributed much to the 'magnetic radio personality' of Roosevelt.

Studies made in U.S.A. show that women listeners outnumber men. In India such studies have yet to be made. Similarly female voices are more popular than male voices, but in news reading some male voices of AIR are very popular.

Since most radio listeners are not assembled at one place there is little or no crowd facilitation, but the auditory stimuli may serve as the unconscious background of mental and motor activities as it does happen in the case of housewives and students who combine working and studying with listening.

How far is AIR effective in educating public opinion in India? With its objective approach it cannot be as effective as the Indian newspaper.

The cinema

The popularity of films in India is growing very fast. India is second only to Hollywood in film-making, and the number of

cinema houses in towns and cities is rapidly rising.

The film is a medium of entertainment and an instrument for shaping public opinion. A typical Indian film is full of songs and dances, and together with a love story, glamorous film stars, trick photography and fascinating scenes, makes a wide and powerful appeal. Many of the film stars are highly popular and their presence at any place easily attracts large crowds. Politicians have not been slow to recognize their propaganda value and have exploited them for collecting funds and winning votes.

Admission to cinemas is still cheap and well within the reach of common people in spite of increasing entertainment taxes. Travelling cinemas are still cheaper and attract large audiences in rural areas. At several places students are allowed concessional rates. In towns most of the new films are released on Fridays and the rush on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday is the highest. Workers in factories rush on pay days. Some educational films have also been made but their manufacture and use is very expensive. Very few educational institutions have projectors.

Film-making is controlled by powerful organizations and they have an eye on the box-office. Because most of the cinema-goers are drawn from the lower stratum of society, most of the films pander to their taste. Many good films portraying social themes have badly failed.

Many films are positively immoral, highlighting the sexy side of life and gangsterism. Fighting, killing, crime with exciting love scenes, sentimental songs, voluptuous dances and the like are the components of the so-called box-office hits Naturally the governments cannot permit such licence and laxity. In most countries there is a censorship of films but the standards vary according to the socio-cultural norms of behaviour Films in India, too, have to be certified by a board of censors, some are for adults only. Some are too long

Cinema-going may degenerate into a mania and many young people are so struck that they are mad after their heroes or heroines, dressing and talking like them, and often writing to them. Some of them are so carried away as to leave their homes to become film stars. Film-going affects health, sitting long hours in a stuffy place and straining eyes It is open to question if it is a correct use of one's leisure.

Some naively believe that motion pictures lead to juvenile de-

linquency, while the fact may be that juvenile delinquents mostly visit cinema houses. Their delinquent attitudes are affected by frequent cinema-going and many of them come from homes which are already criminally inclined.

Studies made in the West show that middle class people attend cinemas more often than those of the lower class. In India it seems that the lower middle class, particularly factory workers, attends almost as often. And persons under twenty-five attend the cinema three time as often as those above fifty.

Some believe that because motion pictures provide intense auditory and visual experiences, they have a more powerful and lasting effect on the minds of young people than the radio or picture magazines. This effect is further heightened by the real life quality of pictures and audiences, and by the escape they provide from the drab monotony of daily living.

Do motion pictures have any effect on attitude change? Experiments have been made with films dealing with colour prejudice. Attitudes were measured before and after films on Negro themes were shown but the conclusions drawn could not be wholly justified because of the several factors interfering such as the past experience of people, differences in social background and intellectual differences. Some investigators in India have studied film preferences of students and tried to trace them to sex, age, and educational differences. They employed a direct questionnaire, and although their conclusions are fairly definite and clear, these studies should be made over a larger area with a wide variety of subjects to enable us to make generalizations on a nationwide basis.

The measurement of public opinion

In Chapter II methods of social psychology have been discussed in detail. Some of them like questionnaire, interview, and observation, can be used to study and assess public opinion. Here we will deal with two more methods, *Sampling and Polling*.

Sampling.—It is usually retorted that the best way of knowing what people are thinking is to ask them about it. But the matter is not as simple as it is made out. It is almost never possible to ask all the members of a population, and since the aim of all public opinion studies is to obtain responses of representatives of a total population we take samples of various size from the

groups in which we are interested. But the problem of taking samples or making selections of people who are truly representative of the total population is not easy and simple.

Sampling of public opinion has been practised on a large scale in the United States of America and their practices show that it is very important to have very accurate sampling methods. During the presidential election campaign of 1924 the *Literary Digest* sent our hundreds of thousands of straw ballots. A large proportion of these ballots were marked and sent back. They favoured the election of Calvin Coolidge by a safe margin and later he was elected. In 1928 and 1932 similar predictions came out true, but in 1936 as many as two million ballots were returned giving the republican candidate, Alfred Landon, a majority of 54 per cent, and a victory in thirty-two states, with 370 electoral votes But this time prediction went wrong Roosevelt was again elected with a majority of 62.5 per cent and a victory in forty-six states with an electoral vote of 523 A procedure which was thrice successful failed miserably the fourth time. What was wrong?

Newcomb raises two pertinent questions with regard to this procedure: (1) How were the people to whom ballots were sent selected? (2) Were the attitudes of the people who returned the ballots similar to those who did not return them? The important thing seems to be correct sampling How can that be insured? The first answer is that sampling should be truly *random* so that every individual in the population has a chance to be selected in the sample. We usually assume that the sample is random because we have selected people in a manner that will rule out all bias such as picking out every tenth person out of a population of 4,000, for example, and having a sample group of 400 persons. Certain principles are used in selecting samples and they are known as *stratification*. We may try to make our sample match certain known characteristics of the total population we wish to study, such as sex, age, economic status, state. These are principles of stratification On their basis we select the same proportion of people in the sample as are found in the total population. Within these limitations, the selection of sample is still random.

In *file sampling* we have the complete list of the population we wish to test. Suppose there are 4,000 names of people in the telephone directory we may decide that a sample of 300 would

be fairly representative. We may select every tenth name on the list and to be still more strict we may decide by a throw of dice as to where we should start. The alphabetical order in which the names are printed is no less random. This method is relatively simple.

Quota sampling.—When the population to be tested is so large that file sampling is impossible we may use the method of quota sampling. We may find out the ratio of Negroes to total population and include Negroes in the sample in the same proportion. We may include men and women, farmers, factory workers, clerks, students, boys and girls in the same proportion in which they are found in the total population, particularly when it is found that the attitudes we are going to test are related to these factors. Quota sampling is the cheapest and simplest method for reaching large numbers of people and interviewers are required to meet different individuals in certain specified proportions. Out of 100 people he has to meet he may select 50 per cent males, 40 per cent whites, 40 per cent Indians, 30 per cent above thirty years of age, 40 per cent between the ages of forty and fifty and so on. One defect of this method, as Newcomb points out, is that the interviewer is left to make the selection of the sample and every person in the total population does not have an equal chance of being included in the group. Many people may not be found in places where the interviewer is going. Again several interviewers are likely to be used and they may have prejudices which cancel or do not cancel each other. Experience too has shown that the quota system suffers from such biases and its conclusions are vitiated to that extent.

Area sampling is more difficult and expensive, but it neutralizes to some extent the defects of the quota sampling. The basis of selection is geographical, and each interviewer is required to meet people in the fourth house of every street or in the third floor of every block. Thus the interviewer is not left with any choice. Not that his honesty is suspected but that the element of his preference is eliminated.

These methods are elaborate and cumbersome, need a lot of time, and are very expensive. At the end of his effort the interviewer may find that the people are not willing to be interviewed or are not available.

Polling.—In any systematic polling very representative sample

of the population should be taken so that they correspond to the total group to be tested or studied. The sample must be representative, for example, in respect of geographical and rural-urban distribution, race, income, sex, and age. Other bases are religion, education, and profession. Usually the educated classes are over-represented mostly because they are more willing to be interviewed. The methods of sampling have been described in the last section.

Another important step in the polling process is the framing of questions and the kind of items that are selected. Questions are of two types: (1) the open-end question to which interviewed people offer their own answers, (2) yes-and-no type of question to which answers are predetermined. The former are more advantageous in as much as the person interviewed is free to express his opinion as he likes and the investigator can assess the various aspects of reactions. Loaded questions should be avoided.

Questions may be asked orally in interviews or in writing through a printed questionnaire Both these techniques have been described in detail in the second chapter The interviewer must be able to establish rapport and secure the co-operation of the people he is interviewing. He must frame his questions in such a manner that both the interviewer and the interviewed understand the same thing from the question. Usually in any public opinion survey at first a small group is studied with open-end questions and then a larger sample is tested with poll or predetermined response questionnaire. Later the findings are interpreted.

One way of interpreting poll results is to find out how [illegible] ly the expressed attitude is held by the respondents. The [illegible] method is to ask how strongly they feel about the issue—Whether they feel very strongly, fairly strongly or indifferently. This [illegible] not be very satisfactory and shall have to be supplemented [illegible] self-rating method showing relationship between [illegible] attitude and types of questions.

Panel studies involve a sample of people who are [illegible] repeatedly over a period of time in order to study the [illegible] opinion occurring. In an election campaign [illegible] would help in the study of votes in the making. [illegible] in Erie County, Ohio, in 1940, and since then [illegible] tical campaigns have been studied by these [illegible]

tion in public opinion is from a sample to a total population, and Asch is very critical that such predictions cannot be considered scientific in the true sense of the term. Even if they have 'predictive value within limits' as Sargent and Williamson argue they are very expensive and time-consuming.

Value of public opinion surveys

With the spread of democratic ideas and institutions, nationwide polls must be carried out regularly on many social, political, economic, and international questions of public interest. They help to gauge public opinion and their results can be put to a number of practical uses. The large-scale nature of these surveys and the rapidity with which answers are required have encouraged the use of polling in preference to attitude scales and techniques. But they are not without their drawbacks. In the first place people may follow what the polls predict even though they think that it is not the correct course of action. At elections people crying without foundation that their party is winning are able to influence voting, and when the poll results follow systematic surveys they will carry greater prestige in swaying public opinion.

Secondly, public opinion survey by supplying information about what the public is thinking may dishearten the leaders who are planning to change and direct their opinion in a certain direction. Not knowing their opinion he may to some extent succeed in his job.

Thirdly, there is a danger that the public opinion survey may not come out true as it happened with the *Readers' Digest* survey in 1936 when Roosevelt was elected with a thumping majority.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

NEWCOMB, T. M. Social Psychology (London: Tavistock Publishers Ltd.)

YOUNG, K. *Outline of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.).

SARGENT, S. S. and WILLIAMSON, R. C. *Social Psychology* (New York: The Ronald Press Company).

KRECH, D. and KRUTCHFIELD, R. S. *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc.).

ASCH, S. E. *Social Psychology* (New York: Prentice-Hall).

CHAPTER XII

PROPAGANDA

PROPAGANDA is a powerful weapon of social control, an organized attempt to manipulate public opinion and divert it toward a specific course of action. It becomes inevitable in modern age when democratic ideas and institutions are gaining popularity and public opinion has become a force to be reckoned with, it has assumed a powerful and gigantic role with rapid advances and improvement in the media of mass communication like printing, radio, and motion pictures. In this chapter we shall inquire into the nature of propaganda, its effects, techniques and principles, how it differs from education and what defences can be built against its influence.

The nature of propaganda

Propaganda is a deliberate effort to control the behaviour and relations of social groups through the use of methods which affect the feelings and attitudes of individuals who make up the groups, and persuade them to a specific course of action For most of the English-speaking people the term 'propaganda' implies deceit, a process underhand and unethical deliberately designed to mislead and exploit others. That is why the term is applied mostly to the attempts of our opponents to persuade others rather than to our own efforts in this direction. Governments are often accused of using propaganda to mislead the people into believing what they wish them to believe, and commercial organizations through well directed publicity are able to persuade the public to buy their products. Both use media of mass communication made available by advances in technology.

The term propaganda got a bad name during the two World Wars when both sides spread lies about each other, about their own victories, and the defeats of their enemies A vast machinery was organized on both sides to spread false information in

the enemy camp and in Germany, Italy, and Japan separate ministeries of propaganda were set up. Their aim was aggressive hostile propaganda against the enemy and building up faith at home in the government policies and programmes. Other nations were painted as mean, unworthy and hateful, and their own as superior, whose place was 'in the sun' and who were destined to rule the world. In Japan the ministry was called as one of 'thought control'. Freedom of thought and expression was a crime and those who did not agree with the state were traitors and landed in concentration camps. The English-speaking people, believing in democratic ways, in free thinking and speech, developed a great dislike to methods of propaganda which aimed at striking terror and regimentation of public opinion. Thus propaganda suggests a manipulation of opinions for ulterior purposes. But in social psychology we are concerned more with facts than with judgements on them, and our concern is to inquire into the mechanism of propaganda—how it works, what are its techniques and how effective they are—rather than to investigate how good or bad it is.

Kimball Young defines propaganda as 'the propagation of ideas, opinions and attitudes, the real purpose of which is not made clear to the hearer or reader'. 'Propaganda is really a device to affect our belief system'. According to Doab it is a 'systematic attempt by an interested individual (or individuals) to control the attitudes of groups of individuals through the use of suggestion, and, consequently, to control their actions'. In a broad sense it is a technique of influencing human actions by controlling their thoughts, feelings and attitudes. Some social psychologists like Charles Bird consider propaganda essentially as the application of suggestion to large groups of people in a planned and systematic manner. This has been facilitated by widespread and rapid means of communication made available in our own times.

Propaganda is a form of social control and we must inquire what are the motives behind it and how do we distinguish it from other forms of social control through interaction or intercommunication like advertisement or education.

It must be clearly understood that all propaganda is not misleading and deceitful. The transport authorities use every possible medium to bring home to the people the need and impor-

tance of road safety measures, the public health department undertakes large-scale propaganda to establish a pattern of new attitudes toward health, food and sanitation. The Indian Red Cross has lead several campaigns against the spread of epidemics, and the Central Health Ministry is employing all media of mass communication to bring home to the people the need and value of limiting their families. They have all used those techniques which propagandists employ but their aims are constructive and socially useful. Even those who indulge in false propaganda and spread wrong information believe that they are doing a service to the community. Dr. Goebells, the Ministry for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda in Nazi Germany believed that in manufacturing information and inventing stories against the enemy he was serving the cause of his country and was inspired by the highest motive of patriotism. Thus the motive of the propagandist is ultimately to influence the behaviour of individuals and groups whose actions affect his own safety and welfare.

Education and propaganda

It is not easy to distinguish between education and propaganda. There are always some people who would differentiate between education and propaganda on the basis of values implied in words like enlightenment, truth, beneficial But if we distinguish between good and bad propaganda, enlightenment, truth and social benefits have a greater chance of being secured by propaganda than by education, for education is a slow process and in times of crisis, when there is a danger of an epidemic, floods, famines, or air raids it may be necessary to organize a lightning campaign to prepare the masses to do the needful Educational agencies would not be able to achieve even half as much as was achieved at the time of the Quetta earthquake of 1927 or of the Chinese aggression. On such occasions what is needed is rapid and co-ordinated action employing all the techniques of propaganda including emotional suggestion and emotionally loaded words and slogans. 'Ornaments for armaments' was the great slogan to collect funds for the national emergency when China attacked us in 1962. Such propaganda is not without its educational value and has far-reaching social and national gains.

On the other hand education of the traditional type is not able to eschew propaganda. All education involves indoctrina-

tion for it must teach the youth the knowledge, customs, traditions, skills and values which constitute his social heritage. The culture in which one lives is a great indoctrinating influence. It is almost impossible for the educator to avoid indoctrination, for even a belief in the scientific method or freedom has to be taught with a dogmatic authority and emotional appeal. In the face of aggressive propaganda by totalitarian states many people began to insist that people should be indoctrinated in the basic principles of democracy. In inculcating basic habits, primary virtues and ultimate values, teachers often resort to devices which smack of the mental coercion involved in propaganda. E. Freeman has pointed out that even the teaching of a harmless and objective material like that of mathematics is not free from propaganda and involves unconscious manipulation of attitudes. He cites examples from Thorndike's *Arithmetic* in which 643 problems in 200 pages emphasize the concepts of capitalism like buying, selling, interest, loans and wages, and preach the profit motive. Of course Thorndike is not carrying on any propaganda but when existing and accepted economic practices are upheld and taught their continuation is secured. On the other hand Russians have tried to get rid of them, but Nazis used arithmetic textbooks to impress upon the young people the achievements and policies of Hitler. It cannot be denied, therefore, that there is much propaganda in education. In fact in communist China, for example, there is no distinction between education and propaganda. Children's books, books on history and geography, and other subjects have a clear bias in favour of the communist ways of thinking and living. In British days books on Indian history tended to glorify the benefits of the British raj. The Sepoy Mutiny of 1857 is painted in the darkest shades and the Indian Republic has called it the War of Independence. Thus it is not always possible to differentiate between education and propaganda.

Even in democratic countries a good part of social education has to assume the form of propaganda for quick results. Speeches, group meetings, books, pamphlets, charts, pictures, and the like contain statements dogmatically stated to influence and reorganize attitudes to certain courses of action. Therefore it may be said that much that passes for education is propaganda.

Yet the aims of education and propaganda, or better still,

of educators and propagandists, are very much different. No doubt in primary education children have to be taught almost all things dogmatically, but at the high school and the college young students are expected to think for themselves, to discover and see relations among things and situations, to generalize and take sides in controversies. Education seeks to develop mind and intellect, problem-solving and creative thinking, initiative and resourcefulness Disagreement, criticism and controversy are encouraged as they help to promote educational ends. On the other hand propaganda seeks to influence people, to persuade and control them through suggestion, for some definite course of action There is no room for disagreement, challenge or fault-finding. In fact, propaganda is based on uncritical acceptance of specific beliefs and attitudes Inquiry, reasoning and critical assessment of facts is neither called for nor needed. The distinction between education and propaganda is often expressed by saying that the former aims at giving knowledge and the latter at influencing people's beliefs and attitudes Knowledge and instruction received in schools and colleges benefits both the individual and the society of which he is a member Education is essentially a social agency In *propaganda such social aims are not present though in examples* of health and social campaigns cited above social aims are the main motives Generally those who differentiate between education and propaganda compare good education with bad propaganda If they were to compare good healthy propaganda with bad defective education the tables would be turned against the latter.

It is better to differentiate between education and propaganda by the methods and techniques they employ

Advertising and propaganda

The distinction between advertising and propaganda is more clear. Advertising is more specific in its aims, it seeks to create a favourable attitude among future customers for a product or business organization. But it studies and adopts the methods of propaganda in planning appeals for the public Doob describes advertising as a direct commercial appeal Often advertising is combined with efforts to affect the attitude of people towards social policies. This is particularly so when radio is

used for advertising commercial products. The advertisements of tooth-pastes on the radio have certainly promoted social purposes of dental care as those of soaps, skin creams and shampoos have promoted body cleanliness. In India, until recently commercial advertising on the radio was not permitted but millions of Indians listened to the commercial broadcasts from Radio Ceylon in which the main body of the programme was excellent, sentimental music with a dose of commercial references coming in between. The attractive voice of the commentator, the prestige of the manufacturing firm, and the sweetness of the music are transferred to the product and strengthen appeal for its use. During the last World War, in Western countries commercial products were advertised in association with patriotic talks and songs. It strengthened national morale and also helped the publicity of the commercial product.

The use of radio has emphasized that effective advertising should be indirect, 'a by-product of entertainment or propaganda'. A casual examination of advertisements in any pictorial magazine will reveal how commodities are advertised through very attractive pictures of children and women. Such pictures are more helpful than any argument in promoting the sale of things. Many of the big firms engage models for draperies as also for cosmetics, soaps and the like. The same face appears in different contexts and advertisements. Thus the aim of advertising is public acceptance of a commercial product while propaganda aims at influencing the attitudes and sentiments of people with a view to directing and controlling their behaviour for specific purposes. It would not be far-fetched to describe advertising as commercial propaganda.

Kinds of propaganda

The layman classifies propaganda as good and bad, the former being devoted to constructive social goals and the latter to misleading the public into behaviour which benefits only a few. But this classification is based on moral considerations and may be avoided in any objective study of the techniques of propaganda. To describe propaganda as frank, honest, and direct or to condemn it as concealed, indirect and dishonest is to bring in motives of the propagandist.

Propaganda is usually described as application of suggestion

and suggestion may be given directly or indirectly, in an open frank manner or in a concealed way. Most propagada is indirect and concealed, for any direct appeal to people to change their beliefs and attitudes may produce strong reaction, for they are a part of the personality of the individual and its criticism is generally not tolerated. Stories are offered and through the interest they arouse their theme is accepted. Commercial organizations selling baby food exploit people's affection for their children and their strong desire to ensure their health and happiness to reap a rich harvest of profits. Their direct aim is to give advice about the diet of babies, how and when they should be fed, but winning parental confidence and interest they promote the sale of their product.

During periods of national emergency, stories and songs, pictures and articles are integrated into a programme which projects attitudes charged with high emotions. Heroes of history are placed in a new light and people are prepared to follow their example, patriotism becomes a religion and the defence of the motherland gains supremacy over all values so far cherished by people.

A new appointment is made and even though the person is not so well known small details of his past life are magnified into big things and a halo is built round his name so that he be acceptable to the public His mediocre achievements are made out into landmarks and a campaign is organized to boost his greatness.

Direct propaganda is carried on by people whose eminent position is recognized by people or on behalf of institutions and organizations whose public utility affects a large mass of people and is not disputed. When these conditions are fulfilled direct propaganda is effective. Pandit Nehru made direct appeals, and when appeals have to be made for funds for a national emergency, earthquake victims or a public hospital, there is no need to resort to indirect propaganda.

Principles of propaganda

There are some important principles of propaganda which must be analysed and discussed to bring out how successful propaganda works.

In the first place propaganda should be rooted in human

motives, desires, needs, frustrations and anxieties. If its purpose is to influence human behaviour in a specific direction it should operate through the frustrated needs of the people and seek to offer satisfaction of those needs. The desire to improve one's looks is powerful and universal and commercial propaganda on behalf of such cosmetics as will 'whiten' the skin is highly effective. During the Chinese aggression people's need of security was very intense and appeals for armed forces fighting on the front were very readily responded to. It is now being increasingly recognized that ambitions, hatreds, likes, jealousies, fears, anxieties and other desires supply motivation for making purchases and for determining opposition to or support of individuals, institutions, policies or programmes. The propaganda for the partition of the country on communal basis was strongly intensified during the thirties and early forties in India. Communal hatred and prejudices were fanned, promises of a new heaven on earth were made where peace, plenty, and prosperity would be readily available to all, and Pakistan was hailed as a rich land of opportunity for every Muslim, free from the domination and tyranny of the Hindus. Fears for the self-preservation of the minority community were easily aroused, communal jealousies were a ready tool, and the build-up was so effective and successful that even the largest political party claiming the allegiance of all sections of the population had to give way. Even after the Partition became a fact and Pakistan was formed, national leaders in that country are still keeping up the hate-India campaign and anti-Hindu propaganda to keep up the national morale and national identity.

Not all motives are clear and conscious. Hidden and unconscious motives are perhaps more powerful, and the propagandist recognized that overt behaviour is but the symbolic expression of such motives. In our country there is a lot of religious propaganda is favour of religious fairs, meetings, rituals and the like, and its effectiveness is due to the widespread moral conflicts among people, the strong desire of the masses to make amends for sins of omission and commission, and ensure a better deal in the next world. Many more obsessed with the anxiety to look more virtuous than they really are, responded to religious propaganda very readily. Similarly in this competitive world most people have an overweening ambition and are for ever

striving for social supremacy. They do not recognize their inadequacy and resort to prestige buying of luxury goods like refrigerators, cars, and the like, just to show off and score over their *friends and neighbours. They purchase high quality goods* not for their perfection but for their value in boosting their prestige. Commercial organizations holds out all sorts of promises of the durability, usefulness and elegance of such goods, offer hire-purchase terms, home delivery and after-sale service and persuade them into making the purchase. These goods are symbols of unconscious desires and motives.

The desire to maintain health, to secure economic wellbeing, to win affection and respect receive special attention from the propagandist. The Life Insurance Corporation of India is carrying on an incessant propaganda by stressing economic security in old age The Planning Commission holds out promises for the coming generations in a highly developed and industrialized economy and induces us to accept heavy financial burdens in the form of taxes so that our grand children will enjoy the pri*vileges which we have desired but not experienced 'If the* country goes, where are we?', 'Produce or perish', 'Share in the nation's growing industrial prosperity', and the like, appeal to some of the basic drives and motives of the people. Tonics removing brain fag, sexual weakness or general debility find a ready sale because propaganda on their behalf appeals to universal needs and desires.

Because in times of prosperity frustrations and anxieties are few and low, they are not favourable for propaganda.

Secondly, appeal to as many motives as possible In elections the propagandist does not merely appeal to the patriotism of the masses but also to their desire to be made much of, to be fed, to be carried in buses and cars, to be entertained by sweet music and to be addressed not only by leaders but also by film stars. In fact in many election contests film stars have made a crucial contribution to the final decision. Lavish entertainment and glamorous processions have marked many meetings of the Indian National Congress Many candidates promise abolition of taxes, better roads and schools, or even a wayside railway station if they are elected

Thirdly, propaganda must respect the social norms and sentiments of the group at which it is directed In Rajasthan the

propagandist seldom fails to appeal to the tradition of Rajput chivalry, to mention Rana Pratap or refer to the colourful turbans of people which is made out to be symbol of their sense of self-respect and dignity. The attitudes and values which the people of Rajasthan cherish and prize are continually emphasized by the propagandist.

Fourthly, the propagandist must have identified himself with the cause or movement for which he is doing propaganda. Communist propaganda is most successful and effective in the hands of a confirmed communist, and propaganda for democracy and freedom fails when it is handled by a party or individual who has thrived on the suppression of individual liberties and rights. The leaders of the communist and Western blocs are able to speak with vehemence and conviction in the United Nations' meetings because they themselves are ardent believers in their cause. A prohibitionist who drinks will be booed, as a capitalist who preaches socialism.

Fifthly, propaganda must be suitably adjusted to the age, intelligence and education of the group to which it is addressed, for unless its contents are understood and appreciated it will have little effect in influencing people's attitudes and behaviour. Propaganda must be direct and simple for the large mass of people are still uneducated and even those that are do not care to get into the intricacies of a political or religious argument. How often had Pandit Nehru to address women in rural areas and he always came down to their level of understanding to be able to have any effect on them. Even if the general public is too busy earning their bread or meeting their problems, they must be given clear-cut statements which they can straightway follow and accept.

Sixthly, the keynote to successful propaganda is repetition. The German propaganda machine during World War II believed that persistently repeated lies soon begin to be accepted as truth. Hitler and his henchman Goebbels created a myth in the minds of the German people that their place is in the sun and that intellectually they are superior to other people and are destined to rule them. Repetition wears down resistance, and advertisers have long realized the virtue of repeating advertisements in posters and neon lights. Repeated stimulation of the eye and the ear catches the mind. But sometimes repetition defeats its pur-

pose, and people see through the game and start suspecting the bona fides of a statement too often repeated. Repetition to be effective must serve some purpose.

Lastly, propaganda to be effective must be indirect and concealed. When a belief has to be demolished it must be attacked indirectly by undermining its basis or strength. The Life Insurance Corporation of India has a vast build-up of indirect propaganda stressing the importance of children's education, comforts of retirement on an annuity, daughter's marriage and the like. Ancient Hindus ensured cleanliness and sanitation by linking it with religion and piety. A daily bath,. cleaning the house and washing clothes is almost a ritual in orthodox homes. Schools ensured discipline and obedience on the part of students by describing it as a religious duty. And how well they succeed!

Tools of propaganda

Propaganda is mass persuasion, it seeks to convert people to accept another's leadership or his ideas, beliefs and practices. They may be his political views, his religious faith, the excellent qualities of his commercial product, or the worth of a book or a film. We have already discussed in the last chapter the media of mass communication, and in the last section the general principles of effective propaganda. Let us now refer briefly to the weapons in the armoury of a propagandist.

The chief tool with which propaganda works is language. Since it involves conversion by persuasion and suggestion rather than by such coercive methods as violence, boycott, or blackmail, the importance of language as a major tool of propaganda assumes large dimensions. Words are symbols of objects and behaviour, not only do they represent them but they also influence human reactions. Just as a person is influenced by the objects which surround him, similarly, he is influenced by the words he utters, hears or reads. Some words are so emotionally charged or *meaningful* that they affect behaviour sooner and more effectively. Let us list some of the linguistic devices in propaganda.

Name-calling is common enough. A very cheap trick is to damn one's opponent by calling him a 'bania', Communist, fascist or a demagogue, and to boost one's own party as fighting for democracy, freedom, justice, or peace. The war propaganda of the Nazis and the Allies illustrated the use of these two tools.

Slogans are short pithy phrases used to direct people's attitudes and behaviour. They have a feeling tone and are highly meaningful in specific social situations, and are received very favourably by the audience. 'Liberty, Fraternity, Equality', 'the right to work', 'Peace through disarmament', 'Quit India', 'Ornaments for armaments' and the like, are phrases which catch attention, endure in memory, are easily repeated, and appeal to the needs and demands of the people to whom they are addressed.

Testimonials from eminent people are also used to give prestige to commercial products. Band-wagon statements are used to make an effective appeal, e.g. 'All wise parents use . . . for the health of their children,' 'Everybody has paid his mite to the . . . fund, have you?'

Secondly, symbols are manipulated by skilful propaganda. The Nazis used the swastika and the banners, the 'Heil Hitler' and the badges and ribbons as indispensable parts of their propaganda machine. They also used the 'The Jew' as a stereotype of cupidity, cunning, and degenerate humanity and such stereotypes are also symbols. Mahatma Gandhi made a masterful use of symbols when he intensified appeal to Indian masses by fasting, making salt from sea water and going about in loin cloth. The use of symbols in religious propaganda is too common and obvious to need special treatment.

Thirdly, successful propaganda makes a clever use of the individual psychological tendencies like suggestibility, emotional appeal, uncritical acceptance of indirect appeal, and the desire to emulate the crowd. Often some very logical arguments are offered in support of a wrong conclusion and the masses are carried by the seeming logicality of the thought process. Half-truths, untruths, and deliberate lies were put forward by the Nazis in such a logical manner as to make them acceptable. Even States which have no intention to trick the public often present half-truths as complete truths or partial solutions as absolutely perfect solutions of problems. Food scarcity in India is explained away as due to rise in population while it may be only one of the causes.

Lastly, clever propaganda exploits traditional attitudes for its own ends, and ideas and practices which are shown to be in complete harmony with tradition for which people have an emotional regard are readily accepted. In India appeal to the tradition

of sacrifice among Sikhs, Rajputs and Marathas is not infrequently invoked to persuade people to make sacrifices for the country and the community.

In modern times propaganda is a powerful agency of social control, and in totalitarian states, as has already been pointed out, propaganda agencies are one of the regular departments of the government. Even in democratic states public relations departments are kept busy studying, informing and directing public opinion

During World War II propaganda played a very powerful role. While Germans had recourse to violent, direct and aggressive propaganda, British propaganda was gentle, personal and subtle. The former offended people while the latter did not even admit that there was such a thing as British propaganda. The British appeal was made to selected people by personal letters and the United States of America entered the war on their side. Later organizations were set up to build up in America love attitudes for the British and hate attitudes for the Germans. The common democratic ideals and attitudes were stressed as also other links of language and history.

Limits of propaganda

The effectiveness of propaganda has its limitations. The use of phrases like 'slogan-mongering', 'It is all propaganda' shows that many people see through propaganda and do not respond to it. For one thing propaganda flourishes where there is ignorance and is therefore limited by a knowledge of the facts of the case. No amount of propaganda can make the people believe that they are prosperous when they are actually starving. Recently government assurances that food prices will stabilize did not cut any ice because people had direct knowledge of the rising prices. Propaganda cannot quench the thirst for knowledge or the desire to think things through. It cannot suppress truth for long

Very often the propagandist meets with a hostile group who may listen to his propaganda but may not act on his directive. They may have stronger opposing tendencies and simply refuse to be persuaded The audience may have loyalties and if the propagandist preaches against them his efforts will only backfire. In India much of the propaganda for family planning is

not making any headway because people have sentiments running against it. No government in India can dare to say anything against the sacred cow though millions of unproductive cattle have to be maintained. Propaganda can only be as effective as people are willing to be persuaded or to accept it. Communist propaganda falls flat on communities which are contented and prosperous. It appeals only to those who are unemployed and discontented. Such objective conditions often limit the effective role of propaganda.

Protection against propaganda

In the modern world all of us are exposed to a continual barrage of propaganda from commercial, religious and political organizations, from the merchants of toothpastes to merchants of political power. And the question naturally arises as to what one should do to preserve his freedom of judgement and action. He certainly cannot engage in counter propaganda against them.

The first thing to do is to be circumspect about the likelihood of propaganda. Often propaganda is concealed and an average citizen finds it hard to detect it. During emergencies governments warn the public against propaganda by fifth columnists or saboteurs. One should try to identify the sources and the purpose behind the communication. It may not be easy if the communication occurs just once but if it is repeated in the same pattern again and again one may try to detect its purpose.

Secondly, bad, unjust, distorted or harmful propaganda can be controlled or eliminated by fostering healthy public opinion. If people are educated to cultivate a judicious attitude toward matters of public interest and welfare, if they are vigilant about their rights and privileges, and conscious of the protection law affords against libel and slander they may kill a good deal of malicious propaganda before it takes root. Often people are too lazy to take legal action.

The best defence against propaganda is to take interest in what happens around us and check and cross-check all that is heard and read. Sources of information must be examined and evaluated in the light of what one knows to be true and correct. There is no royal road to intellectual independence but certainly one can cultivate habits of mental alertness and objective approach to their own emotions and sentiments so

that they are not easily carried away by emotional appeals.

Another very effective protection against propaganda is spreading correct and reliable information. In India the government has organized information centres in important towns and set up radio sets in public parks for the use of the common people. There are public relations officers attached to every important department whose responsibility it is to correct false reports and propaganda against their departments. Together with public libraries and a balanced press false propaganda can be held in check and the common man can be saved from becoming a victim of it. A higher standard of social education and public enlightenment alone can offset the dangers of propaganda.

Propaganda and suggestion

Propaganda is frequently made out to be a special case of suggestion, and its working and effectiveness depend on the principle of the ideomotor suggestibility of people, that is, they are inclined to act out more or less automatically the suggestions that are given. The psychological process of suggestion gained in importance and popularity from the work and speculation of early hypnotists and from the investigations in the field of abnormal psychology. Sociologists like Tarde and Le Bon took over the concept of suggestion to explain social behaviour, and later social psychologists converted suggestion and imitation into basic explanatory concepts for all social behaviour. Today social scientists have revised their stand about suggestion and imitation and no longer accept them as distinct psychological processes. It was assumed in the past that certain individuals are highly suggestible and that propaganda involves the process of suggestion, but today it is believed that the suggestibility of the individual is not a basic personality trait but depends on the one hand on the needs, emotions and beliefs of the persons, and on the other, on the situation in which they are placed. This means that the causes of the effectiveness of propaganda should be found in the immediate psychological field of the people.

Now the question is: what factors in the immediate psychological field make people change their belief or attitude or make them 'suggestible'? Broadly speaking it requires a stimulating situation and an inner readiness to react in a certain way. A number of studies have revealed that children and young people

are more suggestible than their elders, and girls and women are more open to suggestion than boys and men. Similarly, the feeble-minded and dull appear to be more suggestible than the bright and educated people. But circumstances arise when the intelligent and educated people are more suggestible. In times of national emergency or impending danger it is only the wide-awake people with clearer perspective who are sensitive to propaganda. Again certain internal conditions like fatigue, lack of sleep, extreme anxiety, prolonged hunger and other factors which lower a person's physical and mental vigour make people more suggestible.

Some studies have revealed that certain personality types are less suggestible than others. Persons suffering from dementia praecox are negatively suggestible, the schizophrenics are not at all suggestible, the Negroes are more suggestible than whites, and 'pyknics' are the least suggestible.

A number of experiments have shown that prestige is a powerful factor in inducing suggestibility. An individual will change his beliefs and attitudes without argument or adequate grounds when another person of eminence and prestige suggests it to him. People listen with rapt attention to classical music of great names even though they do not understand or enjoy it. Poems, paintings or passages are considered of great merit even if they are wrongly attributed to great poets, artists or authors. Many people started thinking highly of dates and taking them regularly when they came to know that Mahatma Gandhi favoured them. Hair oils, soaps and other cosmetics are advertised with the photographs of film stars, and people buy them for their prestige value.

Due to heightened social feeling towards fashions what the majority wears and uses has also great prestige value. The prestige of numbers or majority is often invoked by salesmen when they plead that everybody is wearing or using a particular brand of commercial product. People have a strong tendency to be in line with others and they change their beliefs and attitudes when they come to know what a large number of people are thinking and believing.

Again the prestige of experts because of their superior knowledge and training reinforces suggestions. The prestige of parents and teachers for young people, of eminent medical spe-

cialists for patients or of eminent lawyers for litigants is high and what suggestions they make are accepted uncritically. It may be due to the fact that people have neither the knowledge nor the training to contradict them. Or may be that they have not the courage.

Another factor inducing suggestibility is the problem situation which an individual is not able to understand and interpret. In times of great crisis people readily accept suggestions from others. They have no standards of judgement to meet such situations and they fall an easy prey to suggestions from others Economic and political insecurities, wars, floods, riots and other disasters make people more suggestible, and when they are combined with low educational and intellectual status suggestions easily overpower them.

But there are certain dangers in prestige suggestion. A person of outstanding merit in one field recommends purchase of a product for which he has no special qualifications or asks people to accept his advice in quite a different field. Such a course is not justified, and people readily see through the game. What does a political leader know about hair oils or medicines? What does a scientist know about religion or economics? Nor does the prestige of numbers appeal to all Many people do not wish to belong to the crowd in matters of dress or food, and go by their own taste and standard. A radical does not accept the views of the majority knowing full well that his own are different from theirs

Propaganda in the modern age

The modern age has been described as an age of propaganda All those who witnessed the growth of Nazi Germany were convinced that propaganda is a tremendous power and if systematically organized it can be extremely effective in its purpose And yet it could not have succeeded so well if the political and socio-economic conditions of Germany had been different in the early thirties The defeat in World War I, the conditions of the Versailles Treaty, the large number of political parties and the consequent frequent elections, the low standards of living and the harmful effects of inflations, and the like paved the way for emergence and acceptance of any solution offered Hitler with the actual use of force offered a solution which the

above conditions made people accept. The success of his propaganda was due to the pre-existing conditions and the direction and change of people's attitudes was made effective by these and the systematic campaign led by Hitler's agents. This produced a widespread belief that with effective propaganda machine any pre-assumed conclusions can be put across to the people with telling effect, changing and directing their attitudes and beliefs in a very significant manner.

Propaganda is a means of mass persuasion, it makes people accept conclusions without subjecting them to critical discussion and analysis. In political campaigns, therefore, it brings in appeals to sentiments and prejudices and gives prominence to irrational factors in political life and thought. Manipulating the average voter's weaknesses skilfully it is able to produce spectacular results. On the other hand, it increases the role and importance of the unscrupulous fanatic and demagogue who can easily and readily exploit the stupid and the unstable elements of the population for their ends. With intensive and quick media of mass communication made available by technology like the radio, the loudspeaker, the newspaper and the like, they play havoc with the opinions and attitudes of large masses of people.

The organization of propaganda campaigns on a large scale costs money, and in any progressive country propaganda has increased the role and the power of the big purse. Elections are financed by capitalists and the successful candidates accommodate them later. If the common man marvels and wails that his own interests do not find favour with the administration and the legislature he has only to thank his own indifference to political life and struggle. Even in highly democratic countries to do something big for the common man the politicians need the financial backing of the money-bags. There is a naive belief in democratic countries that propaganda by different political parties provides for a struggle among ideas and beliefs leading to the survival of the fittest, but when certain tendencies in political thinking are backed by finance and skilful propaganda it can buy chances for fair fight between ideas are completely ruled out.

Psychological warfare that is being incessantly carried on by big powers involves subversive propaganda. Cold war is a con-

flict involving all types of techniques and devices to lower the prestige and power of the opponent short of actual use of military force, and propaganda is insidiously and vigorously used to injure the internal morale, the economic interests and the international status of the opponent

In commerce and industry propaganda boosts the sales of products and the prestige of the organizations. Almost anything can be sold with good public relations departments and skilfully organized publicity so much so that in several countries there is a programme of consumers' education to defend them against propaganda on behalf of spurious goods

Experimental studies of propaganda

Several experimental studies have been made regarding propaganda. For most part they are concerned with two aspects of propaganda, the factors which influence propaganda and the effects of propaganda, but these investigations have generally contributed little of theoretical importance to social psychology and have shed little light on the processes of social interaction. All that they have achieved is the translation of techniques of propaganda in strictly psychological terms of stimulus and response. They study repetition, prestige suggestion, the bias induced by name-calling or conveying false information, slanting of facts and other devices and techniques. But they have served one very important purpose, they have helped to educate people about the working and influence of propaganda and to reveal how propaganda agencies operate. Thus in themselves they are a useful prophylaxis against propaganda.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

YOUNG, K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd).

ASCH, S. E. *Social Psychology* (New York Prentice-Hall)

KATZ, D. and others (eds) *Public Opinion and Propaganda* (New York Henry Holt & Co)

SARGENT, S S and WILLIAMSON, R. C *Social Psychology* (New York. The Ronald Press Company)

KRECH, D. and CRUTCHFIELD, R. *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc)

BIRD, C. *Social Psychology* (New York: D Appleton-Century Co).

CHAPTER XIII

PREJUDICE AND STEREOTYPE

As THE WORLD shrinks due to rapid means of communication and transport and diverse races, nations and cultures are brought closer together social problems of inter-group understanding and co-operation loom larger. It is in this context that the social problem of prejudice has received considerable attention in recent years. In the United States many people have prejudiced opinions and attitudes about Negroes or Jews, some are openly hostile to them and some go farthest to the extent of trying to exterminate them. In India where barriers between communities, castes and even subcastes are all-pervasive and very rigid, prejudices run high and are reflected in all areas of social living, inter-dining and inter-marriages are restricted and all sorts of love and hate attitudes prevail in inter-group relations. There are social norms for each caste and community and those who deviate are not only looked down upon but also punished. That such prejudices stand in the way of peaceful relations among individuals and groups is obvious enough but it is not widely recognized that they are harmful to all programmes of co-ordinated and harmonious development and to national solidarity and integration.

The nature of prejudice

What is a prejudice? Etymologically it means a pre-judgement, a judgement hasty and premature, that is, before relevant facts have been duly examined. But basically prejudice is an attitude toward some social value implying an unfavourable or adverse leaning to anything without just grounds or before sufficient knowledge. It is in this sense that the term prejudice is being used in social psychology. According to Newcomb, 'A prejudice is thus an unfavourable attitude—a predisposition to perceive, act, think, and feel in ways that are "against" rather

than "for" another person or group.'* Prejudice is an emotionally based attitude for or against an issue, individual or group, which ignores relevant objective criteria of judgement. Outlining the several characteristics of prejudice we may list the following:

1. A prejudice is a judgement made without adequate consideration of facts An individual having a prejudice does not pause to think or argue, he accepts it uncritically. He makes a snap judgement and stamps people into different categories and classes. Most of our prejudices are acquired in the home from parents and relations. In India a Hindu child is taught to mix with some people and avoid others. There are some castes and communities he is taught to look down upon, he does not eat with them, they are not brought home nor does he visit their homes. Very early in childhood parents justify these attitudes by saying that low caste people are not clean, they eat forbidden foods or they are mean and dishonest, and young people acquire these prejudices without any intimate and correct knowledge of individual children whom they come across in the school or the playground. Such judgements are hasty, without foundation and irrational.

2. All prejudices have an emotional component. They are either for or against an issue, individual or group. They have their basis in preferences, in likes and dislikes. Favourable prejudices induce us to promote, help, love and admire people and things just as unfavourable prejudices induce us to injure, destroy, hate and run down those against whom we are prejudiced. In the United States Negroes live in separate areas, are not admitted to schools, restaurants or railway compartments for the whites, and have their own clubs and associations. In India Harijans reside in separate areas in villages and towns. This segregation is the result of long and deep-seated prejudices. When racial prejudices become too strong they lead to outbursts of *violence as lynching in America or apartheid in South Africa.* The large-scale massacre of Jews by Nazi Germans is another illustration of racial prejudice run amuck When groups develop prejudices unfavourable or hostile to each other and when hostile and unfriendly attitudes persist for some time there grows a social distance between these groups When such social distance continues for long there develop norms, customs,

* *Social Psychology*, p. 574

and traditions embodying that social distance, and segregation becomes more or less permanent. Pakistan is the outcome of that social distance which went on increasing over centuries between Hindus and Muslims in India.

3. People who have a prejudice do not recognize the fact, and if others point it out to them they try to explain and justify their prejudice by appeal to facts. Whites will cite scores of instances in which Negroes have misbehaved and insist that they have their own experience to vouch for them. During the days of Partition Hindus and Muslims would give a long list of incidents in which members of the other community had molested women, killed people and burnt houses, thus reinforcing hostile and unfriendly attitudes against the disliked community. But there were innumerable incidents of grace when members of both the communities saved the life, property, and honour of members of the other community at a great personal risk. Those were seldom recalled, and prejudices were allowed to harden.

4. Prejudices are shared in common by members of a group or community, otherwise they would not survive. Each individual strengthens the prejudices of other individuals in his group, and members of other groups are not judged as individuals in their own right but as members of the group against which there is a prejudice. A Negro is rejected outright simply because he is a Negro irrespective of his personal qualities.

5. Arising out of the last, prejudices are very harmful since they are irrational, untrustworthy and directed against a whole class of objects or persons.

Social effects of prejudice

One of the most obvious social effects of prejudice is that it creates social conditions which confirm and perpetuate prejudice. Caste Hindus look down upon Harijans, avoid them, deprive them of facilities for education, uplift, worship at the same temples; do not eat, live or mix with them; at places Harijans live in segregated areas, cannot draw water from the same well as caste Hindus, and are treated as untouchables. This only serves to make Harijans more backward, to lower their standard of life and conduct, and to make them despicable. Thus a vicious circle is created which only helps to confirm and strengthen prejudice. A prejudice results from conflict but instead of re-

ducing or solving it prejudice adds to social tension and conflict. Thus if a group is prejudiced against a certain religion, what its members say and what they do in relationship to the religion itself and also in relationship to people of that faith may hurt them wrongly, unnecessarily, and, at times, rather seriously. All this may be true of just one individual's prejudice. It is multiplied *many times when many individuals hold the same prejudice*. The history of communal conflicts and riots in India leading to the birth of Pakistan is a glaring instance of what harm prejudices can do. Segregation in America and apartheid in South Africa are the direct consequences of racial prejudices which affect millions of people. Too often the majority in power pleads that it is possible to provide equal facilities for development and progress even in segregation, but in actual practice in spite of legal sanctions segregation has only helped to strengthen inequalities.

When individuals or groups live and work on the basis of a prejudice nobody can say that they are behaving intelligently, justly, or kindly, and yet prejudices against races, religions, nationalities, and political parties are very common and are readily accepted without question

Prejudices against the new and the different can hurt one in another way, for they close one's mind to opportunity. A new venture in thinking and writing, in music, art and literature, a new idea in science or a new approach in architecture and *house furnishing may all meet the stone wall of prejudice in our* minds and we may refuse to take any notice of them.

Are prejudices natural?

Because prejudices are shared by all the members of a group or community it was commonly believed some decades back that they are inborn and natural, and that so long as differences among individuals and groups persist we cannot avoid prejudices One group of psychologists spoke of natural antipathy, hostility or dislike against those who differ from us, and mentioned the instinct of pugnacity in support of their conclusion. The deep prejudice of the whites against the Negroes and of the Hindus against the non-Hindus (now a thing of the past) is cited as examples of the universal and all-pervasive character of prejudice. In the case of the former it is the black skin and in the

latter it might have been dress, religious practices, food, and the like. But most often these are merely excuses for the expression of prejudices already formed and developed. For in the case of prejudice against Jews there are no such signs visible, in fact Jews are so like others that they cannot be distinguished. And it is not always possible to distinguish between Hindus and Muslims from outward appearance. So the theory of dislike for the unlike does not hold.

Others argue that dislike of the unlike has an ethnic basis and may express itself in connection with cultural rather than physical differences. Though the Japanese are no less developed than the Europeans differences in folkways and values prevent them from coming closer together. The Westerners often describe the Japanese smile as wily and insincere, and the Japanese regard the Westerners as cold and repelling. Loyalty to one's culture is a fact but that such small differences can be the basis of hostility and prejudice is not quite justified.

Psychoanalysts speak of the 'death instinct' meaning a universal desire to hostility against someone. People are naturally aggressive, and early frustrations give rise to resentments and aggressions which are projected upon others. It is not that I hate others but others hate me. The Whites hate the Negroes because the Negroes hate the Whites and will attack them. Thus the vicious circle knows no end. Other Freudians explain it as displacement. Our frustrations are attributed to others.

Finally, to call prejudices natural simply because they are universal within a group and are shared by all members is not proper. They may be universal because they are embedded in the social heritage of the group and form an indispensable part of the cultural training which every child receives in that group.

Growth of prejudices

A much more convincing approach is that prejudices are essentially emotional attitudes, that they are a part of what we learn in the course of experience and that their growth and formation is governed by the principles of attitude formation. The social and psychological situations which initiate and perpetuate prejudices are of many kinds, and only a few important ones are discussed here.

In the first place some prejudices are accepted ready-made from older people. In orthodox Hindu homes smoking and drinking are considered sinful, and children grow up believing that *all* those who smoke and drink are evil. Young people acquire the prejudices of parents and teachers. Some prejudices are cultural and physically and mentally healthy people also give evidence of prejudices in their social behaviour because they have grown up in culture and developed all those intellectual and emotional concepts of the world and its people from the viewpoint of that culture. Some decades back Hindus believed that all non-Hindus are unclean and abstained from mixing and eating with Europeans and Muslims alike. Such cultural prejudices are the necessary consequence of the effective socialization of an individual. Racial, religious, communal and caste prejudices are strong when an individual has thoroughly imbibed the social norms of his culture. A true Arab will have a prejudice against a Jew as a true Jew will have a prejudice against an Arab. Many of the cultural prejudices are just ways in which persons of a given culture have been taught to conceive of the world and its people.

Secondly, some prejudices arise out of misconceptions about the nature of other groups. Negroes are judged to be less intelligent, less clean, less moral and less civilized as Jews are judged to be rich, miserly, crafty, untrustworthy and of lower moral calibre. Such prejudices are often encouraged and strengthened by parents and teachers, newspapers and films All politicians are crafty and unscrupulous, all teachers are sentimental or all doctors are hard-hearted are some of the common prejudices based on misconceptions about classes and groups. Most of them are irrational and born of ignorance or misunderstanding. In India interstate prejudices are strong. People have very wrong notions about Bengalis, South Indians, Punjabis, Marwaris and the like and build their attitudes on them without having moved and lived in those areas or states These prejudices are due to irrational bias, hasty generalization or both.

Thirdly, some prejudices are due to traumatic experiences with some members of groups against whom there is a prejudice. Most often those members are not representative of the group and the experiences with them are very unhappy. A person curtly treated by an officer begins to think that all officers are

ill-mannered: A young student cruelly treated by a teacher of mathematics has a hostile attitude toward all mathematics teachers. A grocer cheated by a Bengali or a Punjabi customer develops a prejudice that all Bengalis or Punjabis are like that. A child beaten by a red nosed boy does not take kindly to red nosed boys in later years. One unfavourable experience with some person leads to an unfavourable concept and feeling in respect of the whole class of persons.

Similarly, favourable experiences with one person leads to favourable prejudice in respect of the whole group.

Fourthly, personality deficiencies or abnormalities are often responsible for unreasoned prejudices toward other individuals and toward social groups of which the person is not a member. Several studies have been made of persons with deep prejudices to identify such deficiencies or abnormalities, and though no very clear conclusions can be drawn from these studies some of them reveal that people with strong prejudices lack insight, are strict conformists, are very emotional and are dissatisfied with their role and status in society. But these have to be qualified, and the subject will be discussed in detail in a subsequent section.

Fifthly, many prejudices are due to *ethnocentrism*, the view that one's own group is the centre of everything, and that all others are rated with reference to it. Each group nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts its superiority, exalts its own gods and looks with contempt on others. Hindus will call Muslims and Europeans as 'cow-eaters' as Muslims will call Hindus 'Kaffirs' or 'pig-eaters'. Ethnocentrism leads people to exaggerate and intensify their folkways and to run down those of others. Their own language is divine, their own land is paradise, and their own habits and customs, food and dress, methods of elimination and cremation, systems of marriage, bringing up children or nursing the old, are the best in the world. These cultural values and the accompanying prejudices are passed on from one generation to another, and distinctness of groups is maintained. As has already been stressed the more socialized a person is the more he identifies himself with the group. All normal persons attain group identifications, and the identification process is slow and gradual, unconscious, and with a strong emotional tone. Sentiments of loyalty and patriotism have always been highly esteemed as forms of behaviour only to a

limited group. The tribesman who kills one of his own tribe may be given capital punishment, but if he kills a member of another tribe he may be honoured for his conduct. A person who accuses a soldier of his own country of atrocities may be tried for treason, it would be fraternizing with the enemy. Thus group consciousness is intensified.

The result of this intense group identifications and consciousness is a strong attitude of fear and distrust of the stranger, aversion to physical and cultural differences, and hostility to those who belong to other groups The Whites fear and distrust the Negroes because they are 'so black' and the Negroes fear and distrust the Whites because they are 'so pale'. Group loyalty is harmless and helps to perpetuate group culture, but it poses a big problem, if not a big danger, when it interferes with the freedom and social mobility of others. This happens when a group persuades itself that its way of life is the only way and seeks to impose its folkways on others at the point of bayonets. It is this ethnocentrism which is responsible for discrimination against suppressed and depressed classes or backward communities. Prejudices arising out of ethnocentrism are highly emotional and often lead to outbursts of violence against other groups.

Sixthly, prejudices arise out of competition for social values which are scarce or limited Wealth, land, social recognition, political power, prestige, affection of one's fellowmen, and the like are not found in abundance and there is a great competition for their acquisition. People try to reduce competition in their own favour by forming cliques and groups and developing hostile attitudes toward other groups. Thus there are discriminations in employment because employment opportunities are limited. In India casteism in trade, universities and other spheres of public life has been recognized The political party in power gives preference to its members in distributing positions of prestige and profit. For long there was a prejudice against women in all walks of life. The British rulers in India had developed prejudices against Indians and debarred them from key positions in the State. In the hey-day of their Empire the British were never tired of speaking of the White Man's Burden and of the backwardness of subject races to butter their own bread. The virulent campaign against the Negroes in South

Such studies have gradually pointed to the fact that certain kinds of persons suffer from prejudice. Such people are emotional rather than rational, they readily accept conventions, customs and traditions, and they are extremely self-centred. They are strongly loyal to their group, anxious and insecure, and are inclined to blame others for their own faults.

Allport and Kramer studied 437 college students by a questionnaire and their study showed that the persons who were more prejudiced were more inclined to conform to their parents' ideas and to be less critical of them, that those who were more critical of their parents were more friendly to others, that they had poorer insight than those who were not prejudiced, and that they were more suspicious by nature. Prejudiced people are too conscious of their status, and they have little or no sympathy for those who work under them.

Jahoda and Ackerman made a psychoanalytical study of forty anti-semitic patients in New York City and sought to determine what part their racial prejudice played in their personality make-up. It was revealed that most of them suffered from vague pervasive anxiety and insecurity, an exaggerated desire to look respectable, unsatisfactory adjustments to reality and a strong sense of conformity. The investigation suffered from one serious flaw that the sample studied was highly selective and restricted in size and nature.

Stereotype

It is fairly commonly recognized that our interpretation of the outside world often depends on something other and more than what we see or hear, and that in reading the same article, listening to the same speech or observing the same social situation our responses are not based on objective evidence or reasoning but on beliefs and ideas rigidly held by our group and called *stereotypes*. The term *stereotype* was first used in social psychology by W. Lippmann to refer to the 'pictures in our heads'. In his book *Public Opinion* he pointed out that only a part of our concept of an object consists of immediate or acquired sense impressions and the rest is 'filled out' with ideas about the class to which that object is supposed to belong. Our concept, therefore, is a combination of the real and attributed character of the object. Earlier psychology used the term 'apperceptive

mass' to denote all those previously acquired ideas and beliefs which colour and determine the nature of our new experiences and perceptions. When this apperceptive mass is standardized and common to members of a group it is a stereotype. A stereotype is a rigid, oversimplified, or biased perception of individuals or groups. It is usually derogatory but need not be so To people who accept stereotypes, all Negroes are 'niggers' dirty and mean, all Marwaris are stingy and miserly, all Bengalis are sentimental, all businessmen are 'penny pinchers', and all teachers are idealists. Let us study stereotyping in detail.

In the first place stereotypes are ready-made frames of reference for interpreting objects and events about which our knowledge is not adequate. They are classificatory concepts which are most often false. They are rigid and fixed ways of thinking about a class of people and every individual we meet who belongs to that class is perceived in that fixed rigid way. The above examples bear on this characteristic of stereotypes.

Secondly, stereotypes are fixed and standardized beliefs which are passed on from one generation to another and in course of time are given the status of an axiom. They are not rationally analysed and no attempt is made to find the truth about them. They are blindly accepted and if any member questions their validity he is ignored and if there is any contradictory fact upsetting them it is considered just an exception and dismissed.

Thirdly, stereotypes are based on feelings, bias and prejudice. They may be hasty generalizations which are emotionally toned or they may be analogies wrongly arrived at, but they save us the strain of thinking and analysing. In Calcutta they decry an unmannerly person as 'an upcountryman'. We see a specific characteristic in a well known type and complete the picture by supplying other traits He is a Gandhi-topeewala, that is, he has the qualities of a Congressman He is a rickshaw-puller, and therefore, has all those traits which are generally believed to be found in rickshaw-pullers. Similarly, we have statements like: He is a Cambridge man, he is an agitator, he is from Lucknow, he is an advocate, and these indicate they have the qualities of the class in which they are being placed. Perhaps we need this device of thinking in labels, of classifying people in a hurry, and of saving ourselves the trouble of acquiring critical knowledge about them, for in modern life we do not have

the time to do it even if we have the inclination.

Fourthly, stereotypes persist and are passed on from one generation to another because they are very convenient ways of understanding and interpreting the world around us, because through constant use they become a part of our mental make-up so much so that we *resent* other people taking exception to them or in any way finding fault with them, and because they strengthen our association with our own group. We tend to perceive our stereotypes as so intimate a part of ourselves that we take steps to defend them when they are threatened by contradictory information or ridicule.

Fifthly, stereotypes are an oversimplified description which works as a substitute for accurate facts or individual experience. Stereotypes have been described as group accepted images, ideas, or beliefs and they are usually verbalized, that is, expressed in and associated with words. Bolshy, Yankee, Turk, and the like are words which convey more than the country to which a person belongs and so also statements like 'he is a snake', 'he is an ass', 'he barks'. Words are stereotypes too and express generalized concepts. Caricatures also express stereotypes, as for example, cartoons of Uncle Sam or John Bull.

Stereotypes are very difficult to modify or change, but when under the impact of some major incident public attitudes change, there is a sudden change in stereotypes. When Americans came closer to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic, terms like Bolshevik or Commy fell out of use and the cartoons of Russians also disappeared. After the Chinese invasion of India new stereotypes have come into being. Thus although stereotypes are very stable, events and changes in cultural values may bring about changes. After attaining Independence many of the stereotypes about British people underwent change in India and people began to refer to the British in kinder terms.

Stereotypes have been described as standardized reactions which are unanalysed and uncritically accepted, and the individual himself is largely if not entirely unaware of the part played by likes and dislikes in the process of thinking or acting. In our own times there is a growing emphasis on inter-group understanding and co-operation and on pulling down the dividing walls of ethnic and religious prejudices. And, therefore, among educated people a strong plea is made against the com-

mon tendency to use stereotypes for they seem to stand in the way of critical and rational appraisal of social situations and prevent understanding between groups and individuals. But without the use of stereotypes interaction would not be possible. Through them we are able to organize our pattern of expectations and responding to groups or individuals as if they were of that pattern. Valid stereotypes are based on well organized roles, accurate knowledge, and lead to accurate predictions. Entering a big office building I see a lady sitting behind a desk at the gate and I presume that she is a receptionist, ask her where I will meet a certain official and receive a helpful reply. My stereotype of a receptionist is valid and helpful. But many stereotypes are based on inadequate knowledge, on rumour, hearsay or newspaper gossip. Too many elderly people attribute trouble at a cinema, a restaurant or a railway station to college students. They have heard stories of indiscipline among students though they have not met many of them and build stereotypes which are not valid. That women take long to decide, cannot keep a secret and the like are stereotypes which continue to flourish among males, as men are bullies, they are brutal, seeking their own pleasures and the like are stereotypes which are commonly found among females They are based on insufficient knowledge and uncritical acceptance of what others pass on as gospel truth.

Some experimental studies of stereotypes

The first study of Stuart Rice revealed that our concepts of men and occupations often lead us to wrong conclusions He took nine portraits from a newspaper of a bootlegger, a European Prime Minister, a Soviet envoy, a financier, a labour leader, two manufacturers, an editor-politician and a United States senator, and presented the pictures and occupations in a mixed order to a large number of college students asking them to match the two. More than half the students could identify the bootlegger from his loose dress because it fitted their stereotype. Half the students identified the Soviet envoy as European premier and half the students identified the premier as an envoy. Stereotypes based on dress and bearing determined these identifications. Some of them were true, others were false.

In another study Katz and Braly asked university students to

list traits which they believed were characteristic of the German, Italian, Negro, Irish, English, Jewish, American, Chinese, Japanese and Turkish peoples. A total of 84 different traits thus obtained was presented to 100 students and they were asked to select those traits which are characteristic of each nationality. An examination of such lists revealed that they agreed with the popular emphasis found in newspapers and magazines. 78 per cent students regarded Germans as scientific minded, 53 per cent regarded Italians as artistic, 84 per cent regarded Negroes as superstitious, 79 per cent regarded Jews as shrewd. 48 per cent regarded Americans industrious, and 54 per cent regarded Turks as cruel. Towards the Germans, Negroes and Jews attitudes were the most stereotyped. The Katz and Braly study was made in 1932 and in 1950 another investigator G. M. Gilbert repeated the same technique with a new generation of students of the same university to find that their attitudes were less stereotyped and the agreement was much smaller. This he attributed to the weakening or 'fading' of stereotypes.

Numerous studies have been made of how people defend their stereotypes, how they react to political labels, how important words are in determining approval or disapproval of political issues and the like. The above experimental studies briefly outlined also serve to indicate that the existence of stereotypes is very helpful in promoting agreement among people and thus providing a basis for public opinion.

Social distance

The concept of social distance is used to express the extent and degree of unfriendliness and hostility between groups. The Bogardus social distance scale has already been described in the last chapter and the scope for its application to the study of social distance among castes and communities in India has already been indicated. The scale will reveal the amount of acceptability of different groups. There are some with whom we would like to interdine and intermarry, there are others with whom we would only interdine but not intermarry, and there are others with whom we would neither interdine nor intermarry. In between there are many more shades and degrees. There are groups with whom we may dine only in a public restaurant, that is, neither at our place nor at theirs. Or men

alone may interdine at each other's place but not women. Or we may interdine on ceremonial occasions but not otherwise. Similarly, there are castes and subcastes whose daughters may be married in our family but whom we do not give daughters in marriage. Wherever society is so divided into a hierarchy of communities, castes, subcastes and the like, groups are placed at varying social distances from each other. Historically such attitudes must have been developed on account of varying degrees of hostility and unfriendliness toward other groups. When such attitudes persist for a long time social distance comes to be accepted by groups concerned and is established as a group norm Harijans, Muslims and caste Hindus have accepted such social norms almost as a part of their religion, and for a long time there was no resentment at such attitudes These communities lived in separate parts of the town, they had their own water supply—wells, tanks, their own burial or cremation grounds, eating places, special customs and ceremonies. Much of the social distance is being bridged, and communities are coming much closer together and it is hoped that with growing emphasis on secularism and national solidarity social distance among various sections and groups of the Indian population will tend to decrease appreciably.

Areas of prejudice

Intergroup prejudices are found in all parts of the world, and different races, nationalities, religious communities, and ethnic groups have attitudes toward each other which are based on exclusiveness, unfriendliness and hostility. We shall now study some of the major areas of prejudice

Racial prejudice based on colour is most rampant and bitter in America, South Africa and in some Western countries. At first Negroes were pushed into slavery and later they were emancipated without any social or other preparation. The basic value system of American life implying the essential dignity of the individual, the fundamental equality of all men, and the inalienable rights of freedom, justice, and fair opportunity is flatly contradicted by the racial caste system of the South and the widespread prejudice in all sections gives only second-class citizenship to the Negro. In spite of legal battles segregation in actual practice continues and is found in restrictions in voting.

use of transport, schools, clubs and restaurants, and in discrimination in the working of the police and the law courts, in employment and property rights, in public relief and several aspects of social intercourse.

Attitudes in the South are still more rigid based as they are on racial arrogance and superiority. Racial prejudice is deeply rooted in their culture. Whites avoid the Negroes, consider them sub-human, immoral, dishonest, stupid, irresponsible, highly sexed and all that is bad and mean. The conflict between the white and the coloured is bitter in the South, and the competition between the whites of lower strata and the coloured people is very keen so much so that it leads to rioting and lynching when the former are frustrated. The Negro is made into a scapegoat and considered the cause of all economic difficulties. The Negro is feared and avoided, feared that he might beat the white in economic struggle and avoided that he might outrage their women. There are double standards for the whites and the Negroes, and sexual crimes on the part of the latter are grossly exaggerated. Lynching is resorted to as a method of social control, and though its frequency has declined in recent years it is still a great threat to the Negro.

In the North the whites have a patronizing attitude toward the Negro and the achievements of the latter are often glorified only to show that they, the Northerners, are more considerate and liberal than people of the South. But in the face of strong competition from the Negroes for jobs and the like this broad-mindedness vanishes. Prejudices continue in spite of legal reliefs.

The Negroes partly accept the position and now and then express resentment against such prejudice and discrimination. Their resentment is often expressed on members of their own community. Their leaders are concerned more with the economic uplift and legal safeguards for the community, they are pressing for more political power, more educational facilities, more economic opportunities, a higher standard of living, more civic security and more human dignity. Socially the upper class Negroes have developed an attitude of self-satisfaction and complacency and the lower class accept the subordinate position.

The Americans have the Negro problem on their conscience and a good many of them are really keen to solve it. More Negroes are being admitted to universities and some of them

have made their mark in American life. Progress in technology has reduced the need of human labour and together with the impact of science and liberal ideas on white leaders the Negroes are entering into all areas of life and work. The pressure of world events is challenging the tradition of racial prejudice in America. It is hoped that in course of time this prejudice will soften and wear away.

Communal prejudice in India has worked a havoc for more than a century. It was not only religion that divided Indians into Hindus and Muslims but in course of time they developed different social systems, dress, food, language, manners and morals. They lived in separate areas in a town, did not interdine and did not intermarry though here and there a few isolated cases did occur. The foreign government took advantage of the communal differences and through their policies intensified their conflicts and prejudices under the guise of maintaining strict neutrality in religious matters. Often communal conflict broke out into open rioting and incidents like music before mosques, sacrificing the cow or clash of religious processions were exploited to suppress both the communities and make out a case for the white man's burden on this subcontinent. Legislative controversies over language, reservations of seats for communities, distribution of jobs on communal basis and the like were made full use of to keep the flames of communal bitterness burning. Hindus and Muslims, though of the same stock and having common bonds of history and culture developed very hostile attitudes toward each other. They had separate schools and colleges, separate hostels and hotels, separate places for drinking water at railway stations, separate hawkers, social, educational, and political organizations. Top-rank leaders of both the communities, particularly the leaders of the Indian National Congress like Gandhiji, Maulana Azad and Pandit Nehru saw through the mischief and did a lot to relieve communal tension and bring about communal harmony, but the British Government with the help of the die-hards in both the communities always frustrated their efforts. The Muslim League developed a theory of two nations—Hindus and Muslims, and asked for a separate homeland. Thus communal prejudices were intensified and culminated in complete mutual distrust and the birth of Pakistan.

Communal prejudices have not ceased after the partition of the country and the holocaust coming in its wake. Even today Pakistan is carrying on an unceasing campaign of hatred against India for two obvious reasons, to keep up the communal prejudice which gave them Pakistan and convert it into a more respectable political prejudice, and to preserve and strengthen its separate entity ruling out any possibility of alignment or co-operation. Too often Pakistani leaders are over-eager to explain their prejudice against India as due to such disputes as that over the Kashmir issue, but students of social sciences are of the opinion that such strong prejudices die hard and will kick up some other issue to maintain themselves. The Hindu minority in West Pakistan has been entirely wiped or driven out and in East Pakistan it is struggling to survive even as second-class citizens.

In India communal prejudice is wearing away. But for a few isolated incidents which are usually aroused by what happens across the border Muslims are guaranteed equal rights and facilities in all areas of life and can aspire to the highest office in the state.

During British days *colour prejudice* between the white rulers and the Indians was fairly strong and deliberately taught. Indians were rarely trusted in positions of importance, and there were separate and exclusive clubs, residential areas, railway compartments and the like. After Independence thanks to the wisdom and broadmindedness of the Indian leaders the old bitterness felt by Indians has melted away and is replaced by cordiality.

Harijans too are victims of deep prejudice on the part of caste Hindus. For ages they were considered untouchables and lived like outcastes. The caste system was so rigid as to rule out all prospects of social mobility and once born an untouchable there was no redemption. Mahatma Gandhi took up their cause and through his example and preaching, through large and powerful movements for social uplift and through legislation Harijans today enjoy equal rights and special privileges and facilities for education and employment, some of them are holding key positions in the government, and socially too the prejudices are softening and wearing away.

Reduction of prejudice

In a way the last section has indicated fairly clearly some of the practical steps which may be taken to reduce prejudice. What attempts have been made to study and analyse causes of prejudice reveal that prejudices have many phases and aspects, they are due to many causes and must be attacked from many sides. Too many well-meaning people believe that legislation will do but laws are effective only when people accept them. Educational and social campaigns under the direction and guidance of prestige figures in society go a long way to soften prejudices. Social reformists like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Swami Dayanand, Mahatma Gandhi and scores of other eminent social leaders brought about radical changes in the outlook and approach of people in a matter of years, and broke down *barriers built in centuries. Their own example* was a beacon light to the masses. Legislation no doubt strengthened their hands and they prepared the ground for the acceptance of laws. Harijan entry into temples is a glaring example of what a prestige personality can do and achieve.

Again better ethnic relations can be built by growing mutual understanding and presentation of facts about social relations in an objective and critical manner. Reduction of prejudice is a problem of social change and social changes take place through ideas. Therefore educational and social campaigns are far more effective than legislation. Higher education and shared and common experiences in public life will raise people above narrow prejudices and bring about close integration of different groups and classes. In India the government is very much alive to the problem of national integration and concrete steps are being taken to bring different sections of the population closer together. There are programmes of promoting international and interstate understanding such as interchange of officers and teachers, facilities for travel, youth festivals, national solidarity days, tournaments and conferences. All these help to bring people from different classes and states together and reduce prejudice.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

KLINEBERG OTTO, *Social Psychology* (New York: Henry Holt & Co.).
YOUNG, K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.).
MYRDAL, G. *An American Dilemma* (New York: Harper & Brothers)
BIRD, C. *Social Psychology* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co.).
ASCH, S. E. *Social Psychology* (New York: Prentice-Hall).

CHAPTER XIV

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION AND GROUPS

THE INDIVIDUAL is born not only into a physical world of things but also into a social world of persons and groups, each with its own established patterns of behaviour. It is through interaction with such persons and groups that the individual gradually becomes human and social. Such interactive processes have already been described.

Whether these groups have the simple organization of a primitive rural type or the complex and complicated structure of a modern urban society, it is through membership of, and association with, such groups that the fundamental needs and purposes of an individual are satisfied, and his major accomplishments and frustrations are experienced. Let us study some major aspects of social organization.

Organizations

When people come together to form groups to satisfy personal needs and accomplish specific purposes, they find or create leaders, assign task and roles to different members and frame rules for their conduct. All this is an organization. Organizations are social devices for achieving some specific ends efficiently through group means. They have also been defined as "interlocking systems of social roles" or as "clusters of activities expected of individuals occupying certain positions in a system". These roles and activities are mutually interdependent Every organization develops rules and regulations which are backed by rewards and punishments These help to make the working of organizations orderly and systematic.

In a complex society like ours there are four main types of organizations. *Productive* or economic organizations are concerned with the manufacture of goods, provision of services to

the general public and creating wealth. Food, shelter, clothing, recreation, luxuries; communication and other services fall within their scope. *Maintenance* organizations are concerned with the socialization of people. All education, training, social and religious activities, health, welfare, reforms and the like fall within their sphere. *Adaptive* organizations deal with research, thinking, planning, discovery and invention, arts and crafts. Their aim is to supply and apply new and old knowledge to the solution of existing problems. *Political or managerial* organizations are concerned with the maintenance of the social structure, and the state is the major organization in this field. It not only regulates rights and obligations and frames laws for the regulations of people's conduct but also guards against external and internal threats to security. Of course there is considerable overlapping in the specific areas of these organizations.

It is obvious enough that these organizations must provide for the satisfaction of the common physical, physiological and psychological needs like food, shelter, employment, security, self-esteem, as have been listed in a previous chapter. Social psychologists are spending considerable time and effort on investigating how far such organizations can be made more effective to satisfy the psychological needs of their members and employees, as well as accomplish the purpose for which they were founded. Higher status workers wish for ego-satisfactions, opportunities for involvement, self-expression and initiative, while lower status employees seek good pay, stimulating work conditions and job security.

In one survey it has been found that most satisfied managers are found in Germany and Scandinavia and least satisfied in Italy and India.

The larger the organization, the more complex the communication problems, and the lower its productive efficiency and employee satisfaction. The turnover is low, absenteeism is common, and labour disputes are frequent. But workers today enjoy greater freedom, have greater security of job and draw higher wages. But they are less involved in work and managers are not able to adapt themselves to this freedom of the workers. Many big organizations have therefore been compelled to introduce programmes of human relations. Another measure which holds out a big promise is the growing desire of the top people to

associate workers in organizational decisions. Successfully and sincerely implemented these programmes may help to change the psychological climate of the entire organization.

Social organization

The fact of social organization is too obvious to need special emphasis. We live in families, are members of clubs, work in an office or an institution, use the post office, libraries, banks, and railway trains, and are defended by an army. The administrative machinery, medical health service, the markets, municipalities and scores of other areas of work and life are examples of social organization. Through them we satisfy our fundamental needs and realize our main purposes. Their structure and function are so planned and regulated that they serve our collective needs and interests.

That social organization has changed from time to time is also a commonplace phenomenon. In primitive days social organization of the tribe or the village was very simple. The needs were elemental, tools and implements were crude, and the social bonds were determined by the simple drives of food, shelter, and sex.

With the development of civilized community living some individuals showed greater efficiency or special powers in specific areas of life and work, and there arose the need of specialization of function both for individuals and groups There was a fighting class as there was a merchant or a priest class, and there were doctors, chiefs, builders, tool-makers, and the like. Thus economic and social roles developed, and specific patterns of behaviour became associated with members of specific groups. Such groups had peculiar forms of dress and deportment, peculiar social norms, training, rites, and the like. Primitive tribes had strict codes of discipline, courses of training for the young, detailed rites and ceremonies, and as human society became more and more highly complicated developing complex needs and facing intricate problems, it became more and more highly organized. The nature of such organization was determined by numerous factors like geography, threats from other groups, economic resources, cultural influences, interests and needs The individual is seldom aware of this total pattern of social organization. He is aware only of the groups to which he belongs or

of the groups which make up the total social structure. We shall study the nature and types of such human groups.

What is a group

The term 'group' means different things to different people. To some people any collection or assembly of people at a place, in the street, a railway compartment or a hospital is a group. To others it means a number of people resembling each other in some respect as sex, age, race, or occupation. To them women, boys, Negroes or doctors are groups. But in social psychology such class names are not groups. Mere classification of persons does not yield groups. Kimball Young defines a group as 'two or more persons in a state of social interaction.' T. M. Newcomb thinks that 'a group consists of two or more persons who share norms about certain things with one another and whose social roles are closely interlocking'. W. J. H. Sprott in his admirable book, *Human Groups*, defines a group as a 'plurality of persons who interact with one another in a given context more than they interact with anyone else'. Let us study some of the essentials of a group.

In the first place interstimulation and interaction is essential to a psychological group. This may mean overt action, association, and communication, but some sort of give-and-take is involved. People may be logically grouped according to their height, age or weight or they may be grouped according to sex or occupation. Such grouping may be of value to the sociologist and social psychologist in so far as it gives an idea of the composition of groups but it tells us nothing about the status and roles of the members of a group, their way of life or their norms of behaviour. It is of no psychological value. A village is a group in so far as its residents interact with each other. Women do not form a group but a women's association formed to resist high prices is a group because such women work together for a common purpose.

Secondly, as Sprott has stressed, this interaction should be 'in a given context'. Women in an association work for its cause, but in the family they interact to promote the welfare of their children. In modern society an individual is a member of several groups and acts differently in the context of goals and programmes of each group. This means that at any given time

they interact with members of one group more than they interact with anyone else. This relatively exclusive interaction in a given context is peculiar to psychological groups.

Thirdly, in a group members must have consciousness of the group as a group, that is, they are aware of their membership. This has no reference to the concept of *group-mind* or social consciousness. All that it means is that members perceive each other as belonging to one whole or unity.

Fourthly, members of a group pursue common goals and purposes. Often such goals and purposes are not consciously conceived and the purposive unity may lie dormant, but in times of stress and danger to the group this unity of purpose is expressed in collective action or inaction. How the Indian nation was roused to collective consciousness and behaviour when the Chinese attacked her in 1962 is a case in point.

Lastly, since groups are dynamic entities and their members interact for the attainment of specific goals and purposes social *norms of behaviour are bound to arise* Such *social norms* or standards of behaviour are mutually accepted. They are frameworks of expectations. When two people interact in any group *one behaves in such a manner as to* evoke a particular response in the other, and the second will respond in such a manner as to fit in with the expectations of the other. This is essential *for the continuance of interaction* within the group. What are termed 'manners', etiquette, customs, good form or traditions are just codified expectations within a group The persistence of such expectations ensures the continued existence and solidarity of the group. The influence of such social standards may be weak or strong depending on the rigidity of social organization in the group

Kinds of groups

Human groups are of many kinds, and *sociologists and social* psychologists have taken pains to describe them in detail. Some groups have long histories, they have several sub-groups and elaborate organization in which the roles and statuses of individuals are carefully laid down *together with rules and regulations* governing their behaviour. Such groups have a high degree of persistence and stability. In modern times with rapid means of communication and transport and an ardent desire

on all sides for mutual understanding and co-operation the world or mankind itself is a group. Then there are smaller groups like races and nations, advanced people and backward people. Recently there was a conference at Cairo of Afro-Asian non-aligned nations. Then there are geographical groups like Europeans, Asians, Americans or Africans. For purposes of social psychology the dimension of size in groups is not so important as that of interstimulation and interaction, and therefore, social psychology is interested mainly in what have come to be known as 'primary' and 'secondary' groups, in and out groups, and formal and informal groups.

Primary and secondary groups

C. H. Cooley was the first to stress the nature and importance of primary and secondary groups and bring out the distinction. The primary group has the strongest bonds of intergroup relation. In the words of Cooley,

> By primary groups I mean those characterized by intimate face to face association and co-operation. They are primary is several senses, but chiefly in that they are fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual. The result of intimate association is a certain fusion of individualities in a common whole, so that one's very self, for many purposes, at least, is the common life and purpose of the group. Perhaps the simplest way of describing this wholeness is by saying that it is a 'we'; it involves the sort of sympathy and mutual identification for which 'we' is the natural expression.*

A primary group is relatively small and its members can all have intimate face to face contacts with other members. This cannot be said of a nation, community, a teachers' association or the Indian National Congress. Interaction and interstimulation between members of the primary group is direct, and the social stimuli are of intimate and personal character. Primary groups involve warm emotional relationship and members meet each other very frequently. The family is the universal primary group. It is the first and usually the most lasting primary group. The child is socialized mainly in this group. Members of a family live, act and think together, each willingly makes sacrifices for others, shares responsibility and co-operates with others in many activities of the home. The size of the family

* C. H. Cooley, *Social Organization* (New York: Charles Scribners), p. 23.

has little or nothing to do with the collective feeling of members.

Another primary group is the play-group, especially of children. It also is an intimate and direct face to face relationship, and involves a strong we-feeling There are common interests and common activities, joint planning of play programmes and wholehearted co-operation in carrying them out. The gangs of teenagers have very strong group loyalties so much as to overrule family loyalties at least for some time.

Another primary group is the neighbourhood which has common elements as manners, traditions, modes of speech. There is a spirit of fellowship and direct personal relationships.

Then there are very small primary groups which may be called congeniality groups and in which people discover a sense of friendliness and congeniality on being thrown together. Such groups are often leisure-time groups, they are highly informal *and have no rules or formal meeting places*

These groups are called primary because they are first both in time and importance They have a great effect on the development of personality because in the early formative years of infancy and childhood every individual lives and moves in them. Cooley very appropriately describes them as 'the nursery of human nature'. They teach the child sentiments of loyalty, fairplay, ambition, sympathy, and fellowship which help to change the individual into a person

It must be noted, however, that contacts may be direct, face to face, without being intimate as it happens in any meeting place like a railway compartment or a cinema house Or alternatively it may be intimate without being face to face as it happens among pen-friends or members of a small association or committee who take decisions by correspondence According to Cooley the essential elements are close intimacy, face to face contact, and a fusion of personalities Some members of a family may go abroad for several years and still belong to the primary *group.*

In primitive society people's contacts and associations are all of the primary sort. The same thing holds true of small village communities In large urban societies group life is highly differentiated and a person may be a member of scores of other groups like the political party, rate-payers' association, tennis club, consumers' co-operative, professional union These groups

are not only differently organized and have a different structure, but they also give a different type of experience which lacks in intimacy and total identification. They are *secondary groups.* It is within the context of primary groups that we find the deepest satisfactions and the most provoking frustrations, because such groups are more closely involved in the satisfaction of our more basic needs like hunger, thirst, sex, love and security.

Secondary groups are characterized by relationships which are more casual, abstract, intellectualized, and indirect, and less personal and intimate. One's profession, school, social class, political party, religious bodies, clubs or brotherhoods are examples of secondary groups. No doubt people do get emotionally involved in the defence of these groups or in the pursuit of their aims and objectives, but such involvement is usually directed toward some symbol or abstract idea of the group rather than toward its individual members. In modern civilization secondary groups are of great importance. They reflect and express the cultural life of the community.

Secondary groups satisfy partial and special needs and interests, and are sometimes described as 'special interest groups'. They do not involve face to face contact as leaders of pacifist movement in several countries carry on their programme through letters and circulars. And even face to face contacts may not lead to intimacy as happens in a railway compartment. Secondary groups because of specialized interest are able to chalk out elaborate programmes, frame rules and regulations governing their procedure and set up offices and institutions. In such organized groups the roles of members are carefully defined and some members are selected or elected to play leading roles as office bearers. Some secondary groups persist and become permanent institutions.

Kimball Young points out that 'the basic habits, attitudes, and roles built up in primary groups carry over to one's participation in secondary associations'. Impatience with, and hostility to, authority, fellow-feeling, and leadership are attitudes which people acquire in the family or the play-group, and then carry them into later life in secondary groups.

In-groups and out-groups

This distinction is based on intergroup relations. The in-group is the we-group in which members hold together and have a sense of loyalty, friendliness, co-operation and unity toward the group There is a feeling of love and sympathy toward members of one's own group, and we are kindly disposed toward people whom we recognize as belonging to our own group. In moments of stress and crisis our obligations to our own group grow stronger.

The out-group is others' group and our feelings toward the out-group are of dislike, avoidance, opposition, hatred, and aggression The out-group is the opposite of the in-group and we have no sense of loyalty, co-operation or sympathy with members of the out-group. On the contrary we have prejudices against them. Our social organization is such that in-groups and out-groups are common features of it We have both favourable and unfavourable attitudes toward groups, the former is an in-group and the latter is an out-group.

For every in-group to which you belong and for which you have a sense of loyalty, there may be out-groups whose members are for themselves members of in-groups and your particular group may be considered by them as an out-group. Members of the National Congress consider their own political party as an in-group and other parties like the Muslim League or the Swatantra Party as out-groups Members of the out-groups also feel likewise.

It was once the hope of social scientists that the development of rapid means of communication and transport would help to bring different peoples in the world closer, steam-rolling all differences and helping to emerge one universal way of life and one universal set of personality norms, and that peoples of the world would be able to live together in peace and understanding. But mankind continues to be split into numerous groups each with its own social norms and contemptuous of the norms of other groups.

Status at birth, colour of the skin, religion, accidents of migration, economic disparities and the like determine to which group an individual will belong His socialization means developing in him some degree of in-group feeling All men are not brothers, some are and some are not. Some are his 'friends' and

some his 'enemies'. Such distinctions whatever their basis, between in-group and out-group will continue to divide the world.

Formal and informal groups

This distinction is based on the structure of groups, that is, the type of relation obtaining between members. In formal groups there are elaborate rules and regulations, the status of members is clearly defined and definite roles are prescribed for them. Such definitions and prescriptions are very carefully thought out, and often there are courses of training for these roles. Business organizations, the civil service or a university are formal groups. They require of its members strict discipline and conformity. Sometimes this conformity is overdone and members pay more attention to rules of procedure than to achievements. This is condemned as 'red-tape'. The army, the church or the business organization has a rigid routine of activities, and unless members are highly motivated toward it and have developed suitable attitudes and self-discipline the entire routine looks hollow and fails. Too many members of these groups are intent only on carving out a career for themselves and make a fetish of rules of procedure neglecting the main objectives of the group. Such members try to play safe, are overcautious and timid, and consider means as ends.

There is a growing reaction against formal organization of groups and too many heads of institutions are inclined to meet their subordinates informally to win their personal regard and co-operation, and to get things going and done. In business transactions the need and value of informal, free and easy social behaviour is being increasingly recognized, and many deals are made over a cup of tea. An informal group is not hedged in by rigid rules and modes of procedure, and members enjoy greater freedom of thought and action. A class-room is a formal group, some decorum between the teacher and the students has to be maintained, some social distance emerges between the two but all over the world educationists are emphasizing that teachers and students should meet oftener in informal ways so that they may know each other more closely for it is in informal give-and-take that teachers' influence on students can be more effective.

Membership and reference groups

Membership groups are those to which an individual really belongs, such as the family, the playgroup, the school, the several clubs, associations, organizations and professional unions. It is very difficult to predict attitudes from group membership for several reasons: all the groups are not equally important, the effects of a group membership on a person's attitude depends on his position in the group, his reasons for belonging, and the strength of his desire to remain a member, and, often people are affected by groups of which they are not members.

For these reasons, the concept of *reference group* has become very popular with social psychologists. A reference group is one in terms of which the individual views or judges himself, one whose standards are used as a comparison point for the individual's behaviour. Any group that has a normative effect on an individual's behaviour is a reference group, because he "refers" his behaviour to its standards. Thus reference groups may serve as sources of attitudes and values which are imitated and which provide bases for further social learning. A person does not have to be a member of a reference group to have it affect his behaviour. He just takes the ways of members of a reference group as a model and imitates them. He would very much like to belong to such a group to gain prestige or material advantage or even to promote his growth and advancement in any way.

In childhood young people look up to their parents for learning patterns of behaviour and do and act as parents do and act. Parents serve as reference groups for children. Later heroes in school, films, and playground, and teachers become models to copy and they evaluate their behaviour and attitudes according to the standards laid down by their models. They are their reference groups. The influence of the reference group depends mostly on its importance, how salient and powerful it is in a particular situation, and how much self-involved the individual becomes in such a group so that he identifies himself with its members and their activities, and develops loyalties to their ideals. He defends their programmes and norms as if they were his own and feels obliged to reduce any discrepancies, his attitudes and behaviour may show.

In modern society everybody is engaged in a race to excel

others and rise higher, and one of the ways is to align himself with higher status groups. There is constant struggle between what one is and what one wants to be. This distinction between groups is also based on the status needs of individuals.

The group mind

Some years ago social scientists and social philosophers used the concept of 'group mind' to explain why the behaviour of an individual in a group is different from his behaviour when he is alone. They were concerned with the social behaviour of the individual and the collective behaviour of groups. Distinctions between different types of groups were drawn to bring out the different psychological atmosphere of different groups. The social psychologists of the previous generation held that a group has a will, a consciousness, and a mind of its own as in the past social philosophers had held that collective life and behaviour presupposes an entity over and above that of an individual to explain collective behaviour. Let us study some of these hypotheses.

Early in the eighteenth century Rousseau put forward the concept of the General Will to justify the behaviour of large masses of people. He held that man is egoistic by nature and it is only for his self-preservation that he entered into a contract and formed society. His political philosophy attached great importance to the individual but he had to explain the conflict between the interests of the individual and the demands of society. He therefore put forward the theory that every individual has two wills, one personal and private and the other public or common which he called the General Will. The General Will is always right because it is disinterested and public-minded. It is the will of society itself, and society is a moral being possessed of a will which seeks the preservation of the whole and the parts, and is a source of the laws. The General Will is the voice of the people, in fact the voice of God, always pure, constant, and unalterable. All questions affecting society are the concern of this General Will.

For Hegel the universe is the manifestation of an Idea or Absolute Spirit. The various institutions and the state are expressions of the Absolute Spirit. The national leaders and officers of Germany are carrying out the behests of the mind of

the German nation. Like Hegel Bosanquet employed the metaphysics of absolute idealism to justify his political theory. The individual is a part of the Absolute. It is finite and strives to be perfect. His moral and political obligations imply a sense of perfection which is the voice of a General Will. No one is conscious of it but it is expressed in the various institutions of society. The family, the church and the state are expressions of the General Will. The state is supreme and free from moral obligations though it is the guardian of the whole mortal world.

The concept of General Will is not capable of being verified, it has worked havoc in political history, and it has not helped to make social phenomena more intelligible The so-called national mind does not always act in the best interests of individuals. The state is personified, but all its actions are neither honourable nor do they always promote the good and welfare of the people. States have made mistakes and played havoc with the lives of people. Nor do the best leaders always agree as to what is good for the people. Self-conscious activity and will can be attributed only to a person and not to a collection of persons who may be pulling in different directions.

Two sociologists Espinas and Durkheim were very much impressed by two facts, one that social groups are not mere collections of individuals but they have a continuity and a reality of their own, and second that in each group there are uniformities of behaviour known as customs, conventions and mores Just as the individual is an organic unity of mental states and activities, the society is an organic unity of individuals. Social groups are real, they adapt themselves to changing situations like the individual, and like him they are self-conscious. Society has mind and consciousness. Durkheim elaborated the analogy between the individual and society, and held that an aggregate of people have experience and consciousness

In the latter part of the nineteenth century Le Bon used the concept of 'collective or group mind' to explain how differently individuals behave when they are in a group, particularly in a crowd. He held that in a crowd a new entity or mind comes into being differing in character from the minds of individuals composing it. Individuals in a crowd feel, think, and act in a manner quite different from that in which they feel, think and act in isolation. 'When a certain number of individuals are

gathered together in a crowd for purposes of action, from the mere fact of their being assembled there result new psychological characteristics which are added to the racial characteristics. Their conscious personality vanishes and there is impulsiveness.' The individual becomes an automaton who has ceased to be guided by his will. He possesses the spontaneity, the violence, the ferocity and the enthusiasm of a primitive being. The crowd is wholly impulsive, changeable and irritable. It has no critical faculty and is extremely credulous. There are no inhibitions and no restrictions of an intellectual thoughtful approach. People in a crowd feel all-powerful. Whoever be the individuals who compose a crowd, and however like or unlike be their mode of life, their occupations, their character or their intelligence, the fact that they have been transformed into a group puts them in possession of a sort of collective or group mind. 'The crowd is a provisional being formed of heterogeneous elements which for a moment are combined exactly as cells of a body.'

William McDougall in his *Group Mind* repudiates the notion of collective consciousness put forward by idealists like Hegel and Bosanquet and puts forward his case for a group mind in a more acceptable manner. By mind he understands an organized system of mental or purposive forces, and in this sense, he thinks, society may be said to possess a collective mind, for society is simply an organization which can be explained in terms of mind. That is, it is constituted by the system of relations between the individual minds which are its units. He offers three grounds for this statement. In the first place, according to him, the individual minds which compose society 'reciprocally imply and complement one another'. The system of relations which forms a part of the individual mind is similar to that found among individual minds in a society. Secondly, individual minds entering society are moulded and shaped by many subtle forces and society is that organized system of forces. It has a life of its own, power to influence and mould individual members and to perpetuate itself. Thirdly, the actions of society are different from the actions of the individuals in the absence of social situations. The society is greater than the aggregate of its members. William McDougall believed that a nation or a society has a mind, a spirit, and a character, and its explana-

tion lies in the complexity of its organization. For him highly organized societies attain a degree of intelligence and morality above the level of the average members, even above that of its highest members. McDougall's views were in perfect harmony with the sociologists of the time who employed the organization aspect of mind to account for the unity, uniformity, and continuity of social behaviour and interpreted the unity of social mind in terms of its organization. Many of them drew analogies between psychological principles holding good for both the individual and a group, and they never saw that they cannot uncritically substitute the one for the other. C. H. Cooley, for example, said 'The unity of the social mind consists not in agreement but in organization, in the fact of reciprocal influence'* McDougall's great merit lies in the fact that he considered group mind as an organization of the needs and purposes of individuals. While he has been mercilessly criticized his contemporaries warmly welcomed his theory There are elements of important truth in his theory. It would be difficult to deny that he stressed the importance of individual motivation by his impressive array of instincts and the great need of searching within the individual the principles which will eventually explain man's social behaviour.

Let us summarize some of the criticisms levelled against the theory of group mind. In the first place the theory is not capable of verification by an appeal to facts of experience. It is more or less a metaphysical or even a mystical notion. Secondly, as has already been pointed out, there are individuals in every society who do not share either the thoughts or feelings of the group. Examples of individuals are not lacking who are not carried away by mob feelings and who are critical about crowd behaviour. Thirdly, as Ginsberg emphatically points out in his excellent treatment of the subject, the case for a group mind rests upon a confusion between mental processes and mental contents. Contents of consciousness can certainly be shared by individuals because of man's ability to communicate thoughts, feelings, desires, values, and the like. That is why in every society there is a body of traditions, customs, beliefs, myths found common among individuals But mental processes can take place only in individual minds, and cannot be shared by

* *Social Organization* (New York: Charles Scribners)

structure and function.

Group dynamics

Group dynamics is not easy to define. It involves both theoretical analysis and experimental study of the dynamic problems of changing group life. It is a study of the changes that take place within a group as well as a theory of the nature of groups and of interaction within groups. It was at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology that the Research Centre for Group Dynamics was founded in 1945 and later in 1948 was moved to the University of Michigan. It was founded by Kurt Lewin and some of the problems studied related to group decision, group productivity, group interaction, group cohesiveness, group communication, and the like. The underlying assumption was that laws of group behaviour can be established independently of the goals or specific activities of the group and irrespective of the structure of the group. Studies of the organization of groups and the interrelationships which exist among their members are of interest not only to the psychologists and social scientists but to all those who are working in human relations in any walk of life.

Some degree of organization is essential for an effective functioning of a group, and depends on the proportion of well-defined roles members have in the group In a highly organized group every member is assigned a specific role and acts toward other members in a prescribed manner. Accustomed to working together effectively members of an organized group carry over this effectiveness into situations and tasks which are not connected with specific functions of the group. In one study the behaviour of ten groups consisting of six members each was studied in frustrating problem-solving situations. Five groups were highly organized consisting of athletic teams and five were unorganized consisting of students who did not know each other. Each group was asked to solve three problems which seemed easy but were quite taxing The organized groups showed greater motivation to solve the problems, greater co-operation and greater frustration at failure. Experiments have been made with group learning under stress conditions and they show that organized groups met the challenge of problem situation more effectively than individuals who were not so organized.

Again the organization of some groups is democratic, of some authoritarian and of others just haphazard, and experimental studies have been made to inquire if the type of organization is related to productive efficiency. The amount of work accomplished was higher in an authoritarian group but it was much lower when the source of authority was absent. The democratic group did less work but they showed greater co-operation and motivation, and were more satisfied. Members in a democratic group showed greater sense of solidarity. And the third type of organization was poor and low in all respects.

In a number of important studies Lewin and his associates compared the effects of group decision and lectures or individual canvassing in changing food habits. In one study they found it easier to persuade mothers to use orange juice and cod-liver oil in the care of their children through group decision than through individual instruction. Usually when individuals are shifted from one job to another there is some resistance, some loss in production and some loss in personnel, that is, some workers quit. An experiment was conducted in a clothing factory to prevent loss in time, money and personnel. Four groups of girls were taken. The first group was told that a change is coming, that they would receive a bonus for re-learning their job and that production standards would practicably be the same as before. Two groups were handled democratically. The reason and nature of the proposed changes were explained to them, and they were requested to plan their own work. The fourth group was informed through two of their members about the changes that were planned. The results showed clear superiority in the method of democratic participation. The second and third groups who had the freedom to plan and discuss programmes reached production standards soon enough, while the first and the fourth dropped in production. Thus the method of democratic participation through group discussion was found to be much more effective.

The areas of study in group dynamics have been indicated and it would take us too far afield to record experimental studies carried in them. Only a few examples are given to give readers some idea of the nature of such investigations.

Changes take place within groups and it is an interesting field of study to describe the conditions of such changes and the

directions in which groups change their form and function In any society groups are constantly being formed and re-formed. Some die early, others survive for long. Some keep their programmes changing, others have steadfast objectives. Frequent changes in groups often indicate vigour to adapt to new situations or they may be due to fickleness of leaders The objectives of changes should be to inject new life into the group, to restore balance in group life and to reduce group tension. When conflict and tension within the group increases and there is a danger of an open flare-up, some strong remedial measures are urgently called for. One useful device is to set up more effective sub-groups which may act counter to the powerful groups which are usurping power. Some changes in key positions inside the group may be necessary. Some people or groups may have to be excluded or some innocent people may have to be made a scapegoat. Many political parties need a continual purge to keep them going. In such cases the interest and welfare of the group is considered more powerful than the interest of the individual or individuals. Sometimes the top leaders have to quit and sometimes the entire ideology and programme of the group have to be changed. Often groups dissolve because members no longer are enthusiastic about their goals, programmes and activities, have no faith in its ideology and do not identify themselves emotionally with the group. It means that the cohesiveness of the group has weakened.

Group cohesiveness

Some groups are formed spontaneously and voluntarily to meet the needs of social life and experience, some to achieve a common practical purpose, and some are formed by some outside authority like soldiers' welfare board Once groups are formed, members will find themselves attracted to one another to a greater or lesser degree. The degree of attractiveness which members have for one another is that group's *cohesiveness*. Cohesiveness is the resultant of forces acting on members to remain in the group and to resist its dissolution. In a highly cohesive group members find a high degree of satisfaction in being together, in belonging together and in sharing each other's life and work. But in groups where members have to be forced to attend meetings and where penalties are imposed for non-

e or non-participation in group activities cohesiveness nd low.

ar families, that is, families composed of parents and , are generally held together by bonds of affection, dependence, a large number of shared goods and ex- ces and the like and are likely to have a high degree of iveness. In India, particularly in rural areas, large families together, work on the same farm and share the same nestead, some of them have a high degree of cohesiveness.

Cohesiveness is basic to group life for it means the forces hich bind different members of a group together and resist those ctors which tend to disrupt it. It implies co-operation, affiliations, loyalty, and the like among its members, in fact all that makes members remain in the group. Physical nearness such as belonging to the same village, street or block of building may promote cohesiveness. In India many people adopt the name of their village or town for a surname and in big cities people with the same surname group together. Regionalism, casteism and the like are encouraged through such associations. Secondly, identity of goals and objectives brings people together. They stand up for other members of such groups, defend them against criticism and attack, and are loyal to them. Sumner (W.G.) considers group belonging and group cohesiveness as reciprocal. Festinger, Shachter and Back in an investigation found that in a housing project occupied by married people who were students at a university groups were formed on the basis of physical distance between houses and the direction in which a house faced. Friendship weakened as distance between houses increased and in making friends the opposite house was preferred to the adjacent house.

Some groups formed spontaneously may have a low cohesivenes such as groups formed in a coffee house. But generally in spo taneously formed groups members have similarity of thought a feeling, have common norms and values or share tastes hobbies and therefore derive greater satisfaction from other's company. They are able to communicate with greater and more fruitfully and therefore the group has greater c veness. Perceived similarity among persons leads to ready a d communication, to greater mutual attractivene

When members composing a group are also members of many other groups and have many complex and different interests, the group tends to be less cohesive. Some people wish to be associated with many groups of low or easily terminated cohesiveness, while others are keen on joining a few groups of high cohesiveness.

K. W. Back studies cohesiveness under three conditions: personal attraction between members, members competing for a goal, and members working for group prestige. When cohesiveness was based on personal liking, members were more inclined to change the discussion into a long pleasant conversation. When members were together for performing same task, they were serious and businesslike, limiting their talk to the goal. When they were concerned with group prestige they were very cautious and allowed one member to function as the leader.

When people get together for work, their group activities are dominated by practical or professional interests, but even then they develop social relations The very fact that they are working together on a common task, makes them share thoughts and experiences and develop group cohesiveness. Sometimes work groups may develop common resentment against authority and common hatred may give the group high degree of cohesiveness.

In another study it was revealed that there is greater cohesiveness in a group in which members are compatible and develop harmonious relations with one another than in a group where members had no such relations.

Cohesiveness is also related to morale but is not identical with it. We may speak of the morale of an individual. Morale refers to the prevailing attitude of the individuals in a group with regard to confidence in the group, its tasks and member roles in the group. Since morale is very important for group effectiveness it may be treated in a separate section.

Morale

Morale has been variously defined but all definitions agree about its essential nature. The general level of regard that the members of a group have for that group constitutes its morale The stability and endurance of social groups depends on how strongly members feel identified with one another The strong sense of identification with the group, the earnestness and enthusiasm, and the determination to go through fire and water.

the *esprit de corps* is an essential element of morale. Morale also includes the determination to go through with what you start, to stick loyally to the organization's objective through thick and thin. The Congress volunteers who stood firm even when they were lathi-charged, the Congress leaders who were sent to jail again and again and lost health and property but did not give up their cause, the Jawans in Ladakh and Nefa who are facing privations and hardships of snowy regions—all are examples of high morale. And those individuals who suffer for a cause, who give up lucrative jobs for public service or who renounce wealth and status to serve the diseased and the down-trodden also show high morale.

Group effectiveness depends on high morale, on how strongly members have been inspired to have faith in the objectives of the group, and how intensely they are devoted to their leader. Morale is a necessary condition for victory in war, for high production in industry, for almost every type of group achievement. During the last stages of World War II Churchill was a great booster of the British morale and the effective functioning of the military force, and the civilian population was in no small measure due to the high morale that he assiduously built up.

Groups possess morale in varying degrees. In-groups wish a high degree of morale for themselves and a low degree of morale for out-groups, for they rightly believe that morale is a great source of strength. A group with high morale has great internal strength to hold together and to belong together, it is free from conflicts and tensions, members think, feel and act together in harmony, there is a general desire among members to promote the welfare of the group, and members in general are devoted to the cause and loyal to the leader.

Obviously the factors of low morale are the opposite of those for high morale. When members of a group readily criticize one another, when there are strong mutual jealousies and rivalries, mistrust and quarrelling, ill-feeling among members and lack of faith in the leaders, when members have different ideas and ideals from those of the group or its leaders; and do not identify themselves closely with the group, internal tension prevails and the breakdown of the group is imminent. All these are signs of poor morale.

One of the most important factors which contribute to build up high morale is continued success. Success improves morale as threats and adversity lower it. When the family is prospering members stick together and work cheerfully, but when it has set-backs and losses members tend to drift away. Business organization, educational institutions or political parties readily obtain the willing and ready co-operation of their staffs when they are expanding their sphere of work and growing in strength. Losing concerns, dwindling institutions and withdrawing armies demoralize their members. But success though essential for high morale is not invariably related to it. Examples of martyrs like Bhagat Singh and of struggle groups like Congress satyagrahis show that individuals and groups may maintain high morale in the face of heavy odds and certain death.

Are there any factors in the organization of a group which affect morale? Too many people believe that organizations in which there is strict control, regimentation and detailed regulations have high morale. Such organizations may be methodical in work and efficient in production but do not necessarily have high morale. If members give passive obedience they may be doing so under coercion and may rebel or fall out as and when that coercion is no longer there. Morale depends on the feelings, attitudes, needs and beliefs of members who must believe that membership of the group helps them to meet their needs, offers them reasonable freedom for self-expression, recognition and prestige and provides opportunities for growth and promotion.

Participation in groups with high morale is very gratifying and stimulating to members as participating in groups with low morale is discouraging and unpleasant. High morale inspires hope, self-confidence and courage. Low morale brings apathy, anxiety, weariness and defeatism.

Lastly, group morale depends largely on leaders who play an important part in guiding groups and enthusing their members to do their best for the group

Social climate

Another characteristic of group life is the atmosphere or climate which prevails within a group. It is the general psychological or emotional state found at any given time in a group. There may be depression, hostility or tension in a group, members may

be accepting each other warmly or rejecting each other coldly, they may be relaxed or excited. If this atmosphere characteristic of a group lasts long over a period of time, a sort of climate comes to be attributed to that group. What sort of climate will prevail in a group very largely depends on the type of leadership obtaining in the group. In the next chapter the topic will be discussed in detail how authoritarian and democratic leaders nake a difference to the climate of a group.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

YOUNG, K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.).
SARGENT, S. S. and WILLIAMSON, R. C. *Social Psychology* (New York: The Ronald Press Company).
SPROTT, W. J. H. *Human Groups* (Penguin).
KLINEBERG, OTTO, *Social Psychology* (New York: Henry Holt & Co.).
GINSBERG, M. *The Psychology of Society* (London: Methuen).
NEWCOMB, T. *Social Psychology* (London: Tavistock Publishers Ltd.).

CHAPTER XV

LEADERSHIP

LEADERSHIP is a very conspicuous example of interaction among members of a group, large or small, as also of a social role. Leadership is often described as a process of social control in so far as it makes members of a group accept certain goals and values and the means of achieving them, but a highwayman who controls a group of people on the road at the point of a machine gun exercises perfect control over the situation but cannot be called a leader. Leadership may be explained either by reference to the personal traits and characteristics which go to the making of a leader or by reference to the social situations in which leadership arises. The first is the 'great-man theory' emphasizing the leader's personality, and the second is the 'times theory' stressing the situations and circumstances in which leaders arise. In the study of leadership we may analyse and list the personality traits of leaders or the social situations in which they arise, we may describe the types and functions of leaders, and we may discuss the role of leaders in different types of social structures. A number of experimental studies have been made and their conclusions give us new insights into the phenomenon of leadership.

The importance of leaders cannot be gainsaid They hold the key position in any group. We have already stressed in the last chapter that group morale depends largely on leaders, and they are able to exert important influence on group climate. Even in groups where members have ample freedom leaders are able to affect the thoughts, attitudes and behaviour of people in many ways, directly and indirectly. Within the group they are a source of great inspiration to members, of stimulation and communication, and they can both form and direct public opinion, clarifying issues and promoting better understanding of the issues involved. In times of crisis or when a group has to face

a particular task the leader helps to guide and direct group energy, to rally around himself the several diverse forces and sub-groups and to unify them for collective effort. The leadership of Mahatma Gandhi during our freedom struggle when he brought together different communities and presented a united front to the British government illustrates the power and value of leadership to a nation. Many groups, communities and nations are not able to pool their resources and mobilize their strength for want of a suitable leader. With what relief and satisfaction the Indian people had welcomed the unanimous election of Lal Bahadur Shastri as Prime Minister showed people's urgent need of a leader.

Types of leaders

Leaders have been variously classified according to the area of life and thought in which they operate or according to the type of control and influence which they exercise. We may list a few types here.

The *intellectual leader* dominates in the world of ideas. He has a broad vision and plans the future of the group. He is an idealist and a dreamer. He may fail on the practical side in the execution of his plans but he can foresee the possible consequences of different courses of action. In our own times when education is being made universal and compulsory an intellectual leader will have a larger and more effective appeal than the man of action who ruled supreme and easy in olden times. Or he may just be leading in thought alone, that is, creating such an intellectual climate that people's thinking is greatly influenced by his theories and ideas. Galileo, Darwin, Lenin, Goethe and Gandhi were great leaders in thought and left a heritage of ideas and ideals for the coming generations. Voltaire was a great power in his time only by virtue of his powerful thinking and forceful pen.

The *administrative leader* is a man of action who has a knack of getting things done. His field covers a wide variety of activities. He plans, coordinates, manages, directs, and organizes. Such leaders occupy key positions in government, business and politics, that is, in organizations or groups which have been created to achieve specific objectives or goals, usually of producing goods or providing services. His main task is two-fold, to carry out the

policies of the organization and to keep the processes of organization going. He is often unable to see other people's point of view and just hustles into action with a heavy hand and a single-track mind.

Such leaders are also responsible for policy-making, though in some business organizations and governments the administrator is not burdened with it. This part of his work is often allotted to some other agency as policy-making is left to the Congress in U S A. and the President is only to implement the policies laid down by the Congress

Administrative leaders may be *authoritarian* or *democratic*. The authoritarian leader works in a group which admits of one-man rule He is dogmatic, inflexible and autocratic. He acts with speed and makes snap decisions Such leaders are found in totalitarian states and they expect and force people to give them unquestioning loyalty and obedience, and rigid discipline is the keynote of their administration Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin and other dictators are examples of authoritarian leadership. They may also be found in business organizations and trade unions The democratic leader is less dramatic and snappy He is sober and steady, and is eager to feel the drift of public opinion before taking a decision. He does not hesitate to submit to public opinion and himself creates checks on his own power so that he and his successors may be prevented from becoming autocrats. Baldwin and the long line of Prime Ministers of England were democratic leaders.

The *bureaucrats* hold leadership as intermediaries in an hierarchy of higher and lower levels of officials in an elaborate organization of the government, in business, army or even in religion. Any large organization has a network of departments with well-defined functions governed by a number of rules and regulations which prescribe, define and limit roles and functions. Often these leaders are slaves of such rules and regulations but they are able to preserve the structure and organization of which they are a limb. The vast British Empire was administered by such a bureaucracy and its functionaries.

Some leaders are *agitators* and this is not a disparagement. They take up a cause and lead a vigorous crusade for it They have great persuasive power and their propaganda drives are very effective. In India social reformers like Raja Ram Mohan Ro

Swami Dayanand and Mahatma Gandhi led powerful movements for social reform and through a great capacity to persuade and convince were able to make effective changes in the thoughts and attitudes of people. Churchill's agatation during the latter years of World War II was very powerful indeed and boosted the morale of the British people as nothing else did.

Charismatic leaders are emotional leaders who have come to acquire some special charm or mystic quality for their followers like Joan of Arc, Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Mao, Lenin. The term charisma is derived from a Greek word meaning a favour or gift from God that enables the recipient to have some special power with respect to his fellowmen, for example the ability to perform miracles and solve difficult problems. A charismatic leader is an embodiment of some definite ideology and is able to imbue his followers with a zeal which overflows to all areas of life and work. He may through subtle use of the media of mass communication magnify his role in national struggles and achievements, build up a personality cult as the only saviour of the nation, and project himself as one who has made huge sacrifices for the uplift of the masses and is dedicated to their cause. By his forthright utterances he acquires a halo and charisma that the nation cannot do without him. Social and political backwardness and demoralization of the people when they have lost all sense of direction and purpose and when they are weighed down by frustrations and failure leads to the rise of charismatic leaders with whom people identify themselves and through whom they acquire a sense of worth and fulfilment.

Such leaders even when they are democratically elected do not promote and strengthen democratic processes and free public debate.

Symbolic leaders like the Queen of England or the President of India have no authority or power but are just symbols representing groups. They are nominal leaders who have a high degree of ritual value. The Nepalese Ambassador in India is treated with respect because he represents the people of Nepal or the King of Nepal. Such treatment is based on our regard for the country he represents. Relations between countries are expressed by relations between a nation and an ambassador sent there. These relations are prescribed by custom and international

precedents, and though they have no meaning they provide useful channels for communication and interaction. Symbolic leaders help to make the groups they represent more cohesive. The Queen of England or the President of India symbolises the unity and solidarity of the English or Indian people.

The *expert* leads because of his superior knowledge or skill or both in some special field of work, information or organization. He is usually consulted in planning and policy-making and his role is that of a commentator, he offers ideas, criticises other people's ideas, appreciates what is good and offers the know-how and the do-how Psychologists are advising schools, hospitals, industries in many activities like selections of personnel, phasing programmes and selecting procedures. We have many types of advisers in both government and industry, such as financial or technical advisers. They are supposed to be experts who provide superior advice in the conduct of specialised works.

Political leaders combine in themselves something of all the leader types described above. A political leader is an administrator, policy maker, ideologist, and tries to build an image and acquire charisma for both his election and later prominent role in the government. Later he becomes a merchant of power building up his own system of bargaining, trading, double-dealing, nepotism and chicanery. Often such leaders only make personal gains Because political problems can be solved only through negotiation and compromise and political arrangements have always to be made, the political leader seldom fails to grease his own palm as well and preserves his own share of the benefits. Almost always he lends his support only in exchange of support to his cause and interest.

Bartlett classified leaders into three types, namely, *institutional leaders, dominant leaders* and *persuasive leaders*, but the characteristics of these types are covered by the types listed above.

Personality traits of leaders

We have already referred to the traditional approach to the study of leadership by listing personality traits which are found essential in the mental and moral make-up of a leader. What kind of people become leaders? How is the personality of a

dominant individual organized, especially with regard to his role and status?

Carlyle may be regarded as a good exponent of the traditional approach. In his essays on heroes and hero-worship he has dwelt on those qualities which go to make leaders and it has been argued that a better understanding of the characteristics of leaders will enable educators, parents and people in public service to set up courses for training in leadership of all kinds. In the army and business organizations it is widely believed that desirable qualities of leadership can be secured by judicious selection and training.

There are two extremes of approach to heroes. Some people worship them and follow them blindly. Others decry heroes and consider them unimportant. But leaders are made by followers and owe their prestige to their consent and co-operation. Often people argue in favour of joint responsibility and authority at the top and call it collective leadership. In actual practice any joint undertaking soon gives rise to leaders. Some people do assume command and become leaders. And the question before us is what qualities make them do so?

There is a vast fund of unscientific literature dealing with the qualities of leaders and giving sermons and advice to young people to develop and cultivate specific qualities to become leaders in society. But we must distinguish between great men and leaders. A great man is not necessarily a leader. Often leaders are not highly intelligent or morally superior persons. In fact what makes a person dominant will depend on the social situation, and different social situations may call for different types of leaders. A village community needs a type of leader different from what type of leader an association of doctors or lawyers needs.

Psychology has made methodical studies of personality traits of leaders. Apart from personality tests with which students of psychology are familiar research workers have addressed carefully made up questionnaires to large numbers of people to find out what type of person they consider to be leaders. Each person was asked to record his responses to as many as 142 items. This inquiry showed that many of the qualities commonly attributed to leaders are not so important, and that good leaders are found in closely-knit groups with happy mutual relations

among members. The most important characteristics are the ability to promote the goals and objectives of the group, administrative skill and tact, ability to inspire and win confidence of the members and an insight into what the group wants.

Psychological inventories and tests have also been employed and during World War II work-sample performance tests were used to study qualities of leadership and to identify leaders. Army officers were placed in near-actual battle situations like crossing a river or building a bridge under enemy fire. These tests were used by both Americans and Germans, but their validity is not known.

Some of the characteristics found among leaders were intelligence, social participation, socio-economic status, dependability, initiative, persistence, self-confidence, knowing how to get things done, popularity, masculinity, verbal facility, adaptability. On extroversion-introversion scales or in qualities like self-sufficiency, emotional control, height, appearance or dominance, leaders have been found to be just average. From what researches have been carried out into the personality traits of leaders it has been found that the most important thing about leaders is not their abilities but attitudes and interests.

Many people believe that to be a leader one should have high physical stature. Lincoln and others were tall but Napoleon and Hitler were below average in height. Others point to superabundance of physical energy as the key to successful leadership, but Mahatma Gandhi had a frail physical body It is argued that these people with low stature and poor physical health over-compensated themselves by dominating others, but does every weakling become a leader? Let us study some notable traits in relation to leadership.

Controlled investigations have shown that, as a group, leaders have a higher degree of *intelligence* than non-leaders. Two groups of leaders and non-leaders resembling in sex, age and number were given comparable forms of intelligence tests, and leaders were found to be more intelligent than control groups. But it must be clearly understood that it is only as a group that leaders were found to be of superior intelligence. There are bound to be many non-leaders whose intelligence score is higher than that of leaders which shows that intelligence by itself does not account for leadership though it is a contributing factor

What is the *scholastic achievement* score of leaders? Several studies have been made, and one study shows that scholarship of women leaders is higher than that of women non-leaders. Another study shows that the scholarship of men leaders was also higher. But differences among leaders were sharp. Athletic leaders had only average score in scholastic achievement. It may be that students in colleges and universities who have higher achievement score are able to find time for participation in extra-curricular activities and therefore emerge as leaders.

Are leaders *extroverts*? Extroversion is measured by personality rating scales designed to sample reactions to social situations. An extrovert is a good mixer who manipulates the external world and engages in outdoor social activities. He takes pleasure in action and is indifferent to fine distinctions. But these are not the only traits of extroverts, and most of the individuals combine the traits of introverts and extroverts or are extroverts at one time and introverts at another. Some studies show that most of the leaders are extroverts as compared with non-leaders, and male leaders were found to be more extroverted than female leaders. Some studies have shown only a slight extroverted strain in leaders.

While there are always exceptions modern studies have revealed that the *higher socio-economic status* class has contributed leaders far in excess of their proportion in the total population. In one study as many as fifty per cent of the leaders were found to belong to big business. Economic disabilities prevent young people to secure position of advantage in a competitive society and achieve leadership. Most of them are obliged to contribute to the family income at a very early stage, and therefore, they do not have the time and opportunity for participating in extra-curricular activities.

The situation factor in leadership

The other view is that leadership is a process arising out of a social situation in which at least four factors are present: a group, the need for group action, a leader and followers. Let us consider these factors in detail.

1. The qualities necessary for leadership depend on the nature and function of the group. If the group consists of persons engaged in thrashing out an academic problem through discus-

sion a clear thinker and convincing speaker will dominate, but in a gang the leader will have to be a man of action, persuasive but firm, powerful and practical. A leader in a revolutionary political movement is different from a leader of a socio-religious body. In different social situations leaders are those who respond most adequately to the needs of the situation. So the leader must be studied and analysed as a product of the group. In a way every member of a group is a potential leader, but the emergence of a leader depends on certain skills, interpersonal relations within the group and some combination of circumstances which throw one person into the limelight or pushes him into the forefront. This is a very flexible view of leadership; members become leaders under certain circumstances and when circumstances change leaders change. This implies that leaders must be very sensitive to social changes and must themselves change with the changing times if they are to maintain their leadership. That is why training programmes for leaders emphasize the need of developing sensitivity among future leaders so that they either give up responsibility or change with a change in social situations.

In our own times social situations change very rapidly, and leaders in one type of situation may fail altogether in changed situations. A leader like Chamberlain fitted the British situation in peace, and the wartime situation demanded a Churchill. As soon as the war was over Churchill too was replaced. Hitler had no characteristics in common with other leaders of the German Social Democratic Party but the changing tide of events found him at the top. The so-called personality traits of leaders are in a way selected by the needs of the social situation. It is not implied that leaders who emerge are mere creatures of circumstances and do not influence the course of social events or situations. On the other hand their talents make a material difference to the structure and function of the group Mahatma Gandhi's entry into the Indian National Congress changed the programmes and the organization of that political party.

2. The second factor for the emergence of leadership is the need for action. In the pre-Independence days every newly elected president of the Indian National Congress used to issue a statement of his programme of action in the following year and it is the urgency of that programme which infused new

life into the organization and imparted new significance to the new leader. Every leader makes the group and its members realize that the present situation fails to satisfy their needs adequately. He must make them understand that there is a sharp discrepancy between their aspirations and their present position. It is in the needs of, and discontent with, the present situation that leaders are born and developed. Often leaders create such discontent and needs. Our great leaders like Gandhi, Nehru and Rajendra Prasad created our political needs and showed us the way for mass action toward the fulfilment of those needs. The Swadeshi movement, the declaration of Independence at the Lahore Congress under the presidentship of Nehru, the Salt Satyagraha, the Quit India resolution, and the like, are landmarks in the history of our national struggle, and our leaders were for ever awakening us to new political needs and formulating programmes for their fulfilment. Jinnah, on the other hand, having lost his leadership in the Congress and the country created a new need for the Muslims, led a crusade for Pakistan and regained his leadership.

3. The third factor in leadership is the leader himself. He is a member of the group who is more acceptable to the group than any other member. He understands the role he has to play and understands it better than others. He rises above the rank and file, his status and importance is greater and higher, and he is able to receive the greatest intensity of positive responses from other members.

Leadership also depends on group structure. The function and performance of a leader may vary with the size of the group. In a small group where face-to-face relations prevail the leader has very intimate relations with other members of his group, is able to get more co-operation from them and is restricted in his decisions by the wishes of others. But in a very large group of thousands or more the leader is more dominant and can take decisions with greater independence.

The functions of a leader in a group will be treated in detail in a separate section.

4. Fourthly, every leader must have followers, the rank and file which have less status and are less adequate in playing their social role. Followers interact with leaders but their role is subordinate. It is for the leader to define the situation, inter-

pret it and by [illegible] The pro-
gramme of action is determined by the leader and the followers carry it out. The leader enjoys greater power and prestige.

Some useful studies have been made of the leader-follower relationship. One study relates to such relationship in the Ame-rican army during World War [illegible] system of power, and because the [illegible] democratic set-up they did not like the special privileges given to officers, and those who did not go [illegible] area had very unfavourable attitudes towards officers. But those who joined the combat area had more favourable attitudes to-ward officers, probably because in the combat area the [illegible] discrepancy in the status and privileges of officers and [illegible] were reduced to the minimum. 'Deprivation, danger and death' faced both of them. Another fact revealed was that [illegible] soldiers had greater regard for those officers whom they [illegible] to be really competent and who made a point of giving personal attention and care to the welfare and comfort of their men. But the communication between officers and men is very much affected by the power and status relationships laid down by the army regulations.

Similar considerations obtain in business organizations, civil service or any bureaucratic set-up in which there are hierarchies of lower and higher status and roles.

Leaders have high prestige, a distinction which dominates the minds of followers. Prestige may flow from success, achie-vement, personal sacrifices or qualities of a leader. Indian lea-ders during national struggle derived prestige from their sacrifices and record of suffering. Prestige is what followers give to their leader and depends on how they perceive him. Generally pres-tige in one field is transferred to other fields.

Usually followers consider their leader as an ideal. We all believe in great men so that we may identify ourselves with them. 'Leaders' writes Kimball Young, 'provide a vicarious ex-perience which is strangely satisfying. In our heroes we see ourselves better, bigger, or more active men'* In India leaders enjoy great respect and reverence, greater than they enjoy any-where else. The power and affection which masses gave to Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru were unprecedented.

*Handbook of Social Psychology, p. 231.

They were, and still are, magical names. Everything they did and said was public property. Their lives belonged to the masses, and people turned to them in all situations. The wide mass support they got enabled them to carry out many social changes. The massive emancipation of depressed classes, of Harijans and women, could not have been carried out by any other leader of lesser rank than Gandhi, and to Nehru we owe our secularism and planning. Hitler and Stalin could change the socio-cultural situation in their countries only because of the massive public support they enjoyed. All these were leaders of major revolutionary movements though they followed different means. Gandhi and Nehru have left a rich legacy of ideas and ideals and their roles and lives will continue to inspire and influence the behaviour of Indians. Gandhi is called the *Rashtrapita*—the father of the nation, and the moral and social values he held sacred are being cherished by the people with strong emotions.

It is not only leaders who influence their followers. The followers also influence their leaders. Their expectations make leaders assume new roles and leaders have to identify themselves with the public. Gandhi identified himself with the poor and the depressed to such a great extent that he discarded all clothes and took to loin cloth, and would stay in the Bhangi colony in Delhi and in the East End in London.

The two views

After having discussed the two views of leadership let us try to evaluate them. The first view considers leaders most necessary for social change and holds that certain individuals are bound to become leaders because they have the proper combination of qualities essential to leadership. The aristocratic version of leadership, the great-man theory, maintains that leaders are born and qualities of leadership are inborn and inherited, and the democratic view of this theory is that the qualities of leadership can be learned, institutions like public schools presume to train leaders, and any person who has the opportunity and the desire may become a leader. If leadership hinges on qualities of personality the corollary is that such qualities or their combination are very rare and there is a scarcity of leaders. We often decry that there are not enough leaders to go

round, and even during the lifetime of Nehru people were asking: After Nehru Who?

The second view of leadership is that leaders are the creatures of social situations they are the products of the times, the *expression of public needs. They do not influence history but* history selects them. When a situation arises that calls for leadership, the person who happens to be in a strategic position will find himself pushed to power and will be under some internal and external pressure to use that power in several ways as leaders do. According to this view there should be no dearth of leaders because every new situation will produce a new leader. And if one leader is found to be incapable another will arise.

According to the first theory Nehru was the kind of person who had to be a leader under any circumstances, and according to the second view his rise to leadership was due to a number of situations and circumstances which were bound to push him to leadership. Research investigations support both the views and it is difficult to prove or disprove either of them As is generally the case, truth lies somewhere between the two. In social groups which function in a less rigid and prescribed manner leadership depends less on group structure and more on the personality traits of the individual. The ability of an individual to lead a group depends on a number of developmental and learned factors, interacting with the particular group situations who he is obliged to face. Leaders do make a difference, sometimes great and sometimes small, to the tempo and quality of social change, but the needs and attitudes of people decide who will be selected as a leader, and both will be influenced by situations confronting them.

Functions of leaders

We have already discussed that there is a sense of mutual identity between leaders and followers and this enables the leader to work on behalf of the group both within the context of the group and outside it. Let us enumerate some of the ways in which the leader functions with regard to the group

In the first place the leader must really belong to the group which he seeks to lead. He must be a member of the group which means that he must accept and share the attitudes and

were great policy-makers. Gandhi gave us Satyagraha, non-co-operation, Khadi and spinning as Nehru gave us *secularism*, non-alignment and industrial planning.

Fifthly, a leader must be a skilful administrator and organizer or he must have associates who are such. Some of the campaigns of Mahatma Gandhi were very well organized and often their effectiveness silenced his worst critics. Non-co-operation movement was looked upon with suspicion by many of his close associates in the beginning but they were soon won over. Leaders must be able to enforce discipline, to supervise and inspire action. This is often expressed by saying that a leader must be a good executive, he should guide, select assistants wisely and delegate tasks and authority to them, co-ordinate their work, plan out the whole programme of action and see that the goals of the group are achieved Whenever it is necessary he should be ready to commend and criticize his associates, to arbitrate or mediate in their conflicts, to act as an impartial judge and take important decisions. All these are different aspects of his control over the group.

Sixthly, he should be an ideal example for the group to emulate. His personal example of practising what he preaches goes a long way to strengthen his status in his group. Military leaders set examples of great heroism and courage and their leadership is greatly prized. Indian leaders were almost revered as saints for their moral and social status, for their great sacrifices in the cause of our freedom struggle and for their plain living and high thinking. A temperance leader himself must abstain from drinking as a saint must practise the virtues he preaches.

Lastly, a leader must symbolize in himself the unity of his group. Internally he must bring together the diverse subgroups, harmonize their differences and stress their unity and solidarity. He must stand for the group. Externally he represents the group and functions as their mouthpiece. Of course groups cannot talk to groups, they can communicate with each other only through their representatives. A leader should be able to represent his group effectively by expressing their demands and wishes.

Some social psychologists classify the various functions of leaders under two broad heads, *inspiration* and *execution*.

Under inspiration are included the efforts of the leader to arouse positive emotions of the followers toward group goals, dramatizing the goals and building a halo around them, and punishing and rewarding members according as they hinder or promote the goals of the group. Under execution are included policy making, planning programmes, selecting assistants and delegates for the various tasks, distributing work and so on.

It is obvious that it would be difficult for any leader to fulfil all these functions. We have listed several types of leaders and they help group goals in several ways often intensifying their efforts on one function rather than another.

Leadership and morale

We have already pointed out that the general level of regard members of a group have for the group constitutes its morale, and that high morale means that members accept the goals of the group and are hopeful that they can be attained and that they are willing to strive in collaboration with other members for their attainment. From the various functions of the leader detailed in the last section, it should be obvious that leaders can create a high degree of morale in a group. By his own personal example of courage, sacrifice and service, and by wise planning and vigorous inspiration he can mobilize the resources of the group to achieve the prescribed goals.

The leadership of a country is always faced with the problem of building up high morale and must be constantly vigilant about forces which threaten or interfere with it. Sometimes external danger or threat of itself unifies people but it is for the leaders to guide and help this unification. When the Chinese invaded our northern border in 1962 in spite of great controversies raging in the country the different sections and groups in India combined with one voice to resist the aggression. The role played by the Prime Minister and other leaders in building morale was commendable.

In peace time the factors which contribute to high morale are higher wages for the low income groups, plenty of consumer goods at reasonable price level and social security Leaders must work for them and undertake plans and programmes which will ensure continued prosperity of the group.

One powerful factor which interferes with high morale is the

distribution of a group into numerous sub-groups often working at cross purposes and constantly quarrelling with each other. It is more so in a big country like India where differences of language, food habits, cultural patterns, religion, social customs, and the like abound, and where society is caste and class-ridden It is a great tribute to the leadership of Nehru that the country stands united and plans for national integration are steadily progressing. By far the great forces which will help build high morale and solidarity among the numerous groups and communities in the country are those fighting ignorance, poverty, and disease on a common front. But it is questionable if Indian leadership has quite succeeded in creating such a common front though plans for industrial development, educational expansion and health services are making headway.

Another powerful factor hindering high morale is the narrow selfishness and parochial interests of leaders There is an outcry against ministers in India amassing large fortunes by fair and foul means. The image of leadership in India is not satisfactory and serious allegations of large-scale corruption in high ranks have lowered the people's morale But the very fact that Indians as a group or nation prize honesty and integrity, service and sacrifice among their leaders, and that there are shining examples of such virtues in several leaders fills the intelligentsia with a strong hope and belief that sooner than later things will come round. Measures which the late Prime Minister and former Home Minister—Lal Bahadur Shastri and G. L. Nanda—took helped to raise the faith and morale of Indians.

Psychoanalytic approach to leadership

Apparently eminent leaders are given great loyalty and devotion. People love and cherish them as they love and cherish their fathers. Gandhi was called 'Bapu' (father) not merely because he was aged but also because people looked upon him as a father. But when things go wrong, and people are disappointed, frustrated, and disillusioned, they make their leader the scapegoat of all their complaints and troubles This double-faced attitude toward leaders is common with children. They love their father and they hate him for snatching away the love of their mother. Freudian explanation of our approach to leaders has stressed the importance of early childhood experiences

like maternal pampering and sexual repression in understanding and interpreting the rise of great leaders, and other psychoanalysts have followed Freud in explaining leaders by overcompensation for weakness, inferiority or guilt. Lasswell explained leadership by father or brother hatred, sex repression, inferiority, and the like.

Erich Fromm made an interesting study of Hitler and came to the conclusion that masochistic and sadistic drives lead to authoritarian leadership, and Hitler symbolized what the German people wished for. He created a hierarchy of power in the State so that everybody had somebody above to submit to and somebody below to feed his lust for power. Some psychoanalysts have stressed intense aggressiveness of leaders, others have emphasized the obsessive-compulsive pattern of behaviour among leaders like Florence Nightingale, Columbus. But the psychoanalytic approach to leadership is not easy. It is not possible to obtain detailed data from the early life of leaders, particularly those who died several centuries ago. In the present mood of social psychology such studies can only be considered speculative and without any scientific value. Besides the psychoanalytic approach fails to take into account the social and cultural factors in leader-follower relationship.

Authoritarian and democratic leadership

The emphasis on the distinction between authoritarian and democratic leadership is quite modern. In the first place the rise of democratic forms of government and the sudden emergence of totalitarian states sharpened the distinction between the two types of leadership, and World War II supposedly waged between two political systems and ideologies made political thinkers analyse the rise of dictators, their personality traits and the nature and significance of their appeal and success with the masses. Secondly, students of social sciences have carried out a number of experimental studies of groups in which these two forms of social and administrative relationships were introduced. The personality of the authoritarian leader has been psychologically analysed and his authority has not been found to be as strong and stable as has been commonly made out. In our own times Hitler in Germany, Mussolini in Italy and Tojo in Japan have figured prominently as dictatorial or authoritarian

leaders, and they have been frequently contrasted with democratic leaders like Roosevelt and Churchill.

Let us compare the social systems in which two types of leaders are found. Leadership in a democracy is different from leadership in a totalitarian state. Democracy is a way of group living in which persons who live it share responsibility in making decisions affecting common interests and concerning common problems. Individuals enjoy *greater freedom of thought* and expression, and they have a right to criticise and even condemn government decisions In a totalitarian state all the thinking and deciding is done by one individual, the authoritarian leader, and others have only to obey and carry out the decisions taken by the leaders. There is greater flexibility of interaction in democracy while in autocracy social interaction is rigid and inflexible. People are called upon only to endorse the policies and decisions of the leaders. Democracy provides for maximum of interaction while in totalitarian states it is reduced to the minimum. In the former leadership is the result of a process of interaction while in the latter it is the result of a process of domination in which interaction is limited and the activities of the group are rigidly controlled in the direction chosen by one person, that is, the leader himself.

Our problem here is to analyse and study how affective is each type of leadership within our culture.

Obviously the authoritarian leader has greater power, he alone is the arbiter of the plans, policies, and programmes of the state, and he alone dictates the order in which they are to be implemented. He fully controls the activities of the members of his group, and in Japan there was a ministry for thought control so that people may not think in directions other than those desired by the régime. He has absolute power to reward and punish members of the group. Such absolute power is deliberately acquired by him so that there may be no challenge to it and no one can question it. He tries to appear and make himself indispensable to the progress and prosperity of the group. He encourages segregation among sub-groups so that interaction and intercommunication between sub-groups is reduced to the minimum. This ensures his power and prestige as the segregated sub-groups look up to him for the solution of all their problems. In his absence these sub-groups will

seven weeks. Another leader supervised those groups for further seven weeks and then a third leader supervised them for seven weeks more. These three leaders played different social roles—one authoritarian, the second democratic, and the third *laissez faire* approach to group work and control. The first leader was autocratic and prescribed details of activities rigidly communicating just one step at a time. The second leader allowed considerable freedom of choice, gave advice when asked for and was himself engaged as an ordinary member of the group. The third leader played an inactive role indifferent to what members did or achieved.

It was found that the autocratic leader excited hostility on the one hand, an extreme dependence on the other. Some members rebelled against him, others had no initiative. The *laissez faire* group was most disorganized and spent the smallest amount of time in group projects. The democratic group had high morale, friendliness among members and high level of efficiency though they took more time.

This experiment showed that the leader exercises significant influence on group climate, morale and efficiency, and that the democratic leadership is most effective. There have been some autocratic leaders who functioned very effectively, their groups were more productive and efficient, morale was good and group ties were strong. But such results are due to the psychological maturity of a particular leader.

Experimental studies have also been made of leaderless groups. A number of persons are given a task and then left alone to do it. Experimenters keep themselves out and just watch the group activity. In the beginning there is some confusion and the group is disorganized leading to helplessness But this mood is soon overcome and the members sort themselves out into definite roles and start working. Leaders emerge, and they are either of the intellectual type who think and direct or of the action type who do things with their own hands and thus set a pace for the whole group

It would take us too far afield to describe all the important studies made of leadership. The situational tests conducted by the Office of Strategic Service (OSS) during the world war have already been described in a previous section. It is difficult to study leadership in actual large group situations.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

SARGENT, S. S. and WILLIAMSON, R. C. *Social Psychology* (New York: The Ronald Press Company).

KRECH, D. and CRUTCHFIELD, R. S. *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc.).

ROUCEK, J. S. *Social Control* (New York: D. Van Nostrand).

YOUNG, K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.).

LAPIERE, R. T. and FARNSWORTH, P. R. *Social Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.).

CHAPTER XVI

MASS BEHAVIOUR

MASS BEHAVIOUR, as the term implies, is behaviour of very large groups in which interaction and intercommunication is at a greatly impersonal level such as is found in mass society, crowds, mobs or audiences. Such very large groups may be formed deliberately as is happening by the rush of people from villages to towns or in huge fairs like the *Kumbh Mela* at Hardwar or Banaras, or the assemblage of large masses of people on Independence day to hear the Prime Minister. Or they may *come about by accident spontaneously ,or as people gather on* the road when there is an accident, a fire or a burglary. In this chapter we shall study the behaviour of people in mass society, in crowds and in audiences

Mass society

We have been discussing several types of groups and their characteristics,* but some groups are too large as indicated above. In our own times there has been a large-scale movement of populations from countryside to towns, as a result of which towns have grown to immense sizes containing millions of people. Rapid industrialization and technological advances have opened up vast opportunities for employment in urban areas and uprooted village people to migrate to big towns. In villages they lived in small communities with face-to-face relationships in close intimacy knowing about each other everything there is to know. When they migrate to towns that close personal intimacy is lost, even neighbours may not know each *other and seldom greet or talk to each other. Such large col*lections of people in modern urbanized areas have been termed 'mass society', and are the products of industrial revolution. The secondary groups are small in comparison and have some determining features, but this mass society is indeterminate.

But in spite of the rationality, sense of fair play and justice, and impersonal social contacts, mass society falls an easy prey to suggestion and imitation, to advertisements and propaganda and to emotional appeal leading to grossly irrational thinking and acting. The distribution of rewards in terms of wages and prestige is fairly rational and systematic, and in almost every area of life and work the expectations are very well defined, yet the approach of members of mass society is highly irrational. That is why fake advertisers, demagogues, leaders and the like find mass society a favourable field to push their own interests.

Many social thinkers bemoan that in modern urban living man has lost his individuality, his sense of belonging, his emotional warmth, his sociality. He seems to be running a race, competing and trying to excel others, but without moorings and without any sense of direction and purpose. He crowds at matches, political rallies, cinema-houses, restaurants, and what not to regain his sense of belonging and security, but these are only temporary cures followed by a relapse. Indeed the modern man is isolated and lonely even though surrounded by crowds of people.

Crowds

What is a crowd? The term is used in a large variety of ways but it ordinarily suggests a large number of individuals assembled in one place. It is difficult to lay down a numerical minimum, but the number is an essential feature of a crowd. People in a busy street, cinema-goers coming out or going in, a large number of people at the railway booking office, or a large mass of people rushing to a public meeting are examples of a crowd.

Social psychologists have tried to differentiate between crowds H. Blumer in his *New Outline of Principles of Sociology* speaks of four kinds of crowds: (1) the *casual crowd* like that collects at a shop-window or at a street corner, (2) the *conventional crowd* as that assembling to watch a game of football, (3) the *acting crowd* which assembles for a purpose like demonstration, and (4) the *expressive crowd* assembled for singing, dancing, and the like observed in religious or other types of festivals.

R. W. Brown in his article contributed to G. Lindzey's *Hand-*

book of Social Psychology distinguishes crowds into *active* and *passive*. The active or kinetic crowd is a *mob* and the passive listening crowd is an *audience*. According to him mobs may be further distinguished into *aggressive, panicky, acquisitive* or *expressive*, and audiences may be *casual* or *intentional*. And he goes on to describe them. This classification is much more intelligible and helpful as we shall soon see.

In a general way a crowd is an assembly of people at a particular place. It has no internal organization, there is no division of labour, no leader and no structure. It is a temporary assembly and has no past or future. It is casual and anonymous, though it may have a common focus of interest or attention. There is shoulder to shoulder relationship between members of a crowd and they may act together. There may be pushing for space or shouting in joy, anger or fear. That there is inter-stimulation in a crowd cannot be denied. Kimball Young defines a crowd as follows: 'A crowd is a collectivity involving essentially a considerable number of individuals responding within a limited space to some common object of attention.' Such definition covers both mobs and audiences. In fact an audience may become a mob and vice versa. Quite a number of times the mammoth gatherings in the National Congress meetings become mobs. Entering the pandal to look and listen as an audience should they are upset about some remark by a speaker, are emotionally aroused and start shouting and gesticulating, even rushing toward the stage. Thus an audience degenerates into a mob. But soon enough an eminent leader like Nehru would get up and pacify them, and the mob would again become quiet and transform itself into an audience. Even very peaceful audiences at a religious discourse become mobs at the slightest provocation like the failure of light or loudspeakers, or the lack of seating accommodation. And very rowdy mobs have been changed into quiet audiences by the police force or the influential lead given by some eminent person.

We shall now discuss the characteristics and behaviour of mobs and audiences.

Mobs

Mobs are crowds in action and their behaviour has certain common characteristics which may be listed here.

In the first place mobs are characterized by *mental homogeneity*, that is, similarity of ideas, feelings and actions. Members of a mob have the same focus of interest and attention. There is a common object of interest arousing similar ideas and emotions in the minds of each individual constituting the mob. 'In addition there generally supervenes a kind of feeling of the "presence" of others and a realization that one's ideas and emotions are shared by others. These characteristics imply and depend upon a certain homogeneity in the constituent members. To be attracted by the same common object of interest, people must have a good deal in common, apart from variations in age, education, occupation or social status.'*

This homogeneity has led a number of social psychologists to put forward the hypothesis of collective consciousness or group mind, but what is being suggested here is nothing more than a tendency to conform not only in thought and belief but also in feeling and action

A second characteristic of mobs is their strong *emotionality* Whatever emotions sway them are of very great intensity. Fear turns them panicky, anger makes them violent and furious, joy makes them hilarious. This widespread and heightened emotional behaviour in mobs arises because the most common exciting cause of emotions is the emotional behaviour of other people. Our strongest emotions generally arise in social relationships, and the part played by suggestion and imitation is not insignificant. Emotional responses are increased and intensified by the responses, gestures, verbal outbursts, clapping, comments and cries of others. As we shall see later fear and anger spread like lightning and their intensification is mostly due to what Ginsberg calls 'the cumulative repetition of the stimulus'.

A third characteristic arising out of the second is *irrationality*. In the throes of violent emotions members of a mob seldom pause to think, much less to argue or reason. In mob behaviour thought and reason are subordinated to blind emotions, and members of a mob function as fickle, credulous, intolerant and irrational human beings In classical literature of both the East and the West, and in older psychology stupidity or irrationality is believed to go with wild emotionality, and Le Bon says the

Morris Ginsberg, *The Psychology of Society* (London: Methuen & Co), pp 129-30.

the crowd is always intellectually inferior. Excitement is the mark of the crowd and excited people have no time to pause and think, particularly when they are excited together. To be able to judge and decide rationally and judiciously one must be cool and sober. Mobs are highly impulsive because they are more often composed of people who are extroverts and relatively uninhibited rather than those who are thoughtful, steady introverts.

Several psychologists have emphasized that crowds are generally less intelligent than individuals. It may be partly accounted for by the fact that mob behaviour is determined by the highest common factor among its members and this is always lower than the intellectual development of some individuals, and partly by the fact that the more intelligent and thoughtful people are very suspicious of crowds and generally avoid them. Mob behaviour involves appeals and in order that appeals may be understood by all members of the mob their level has to be lowered. That is why mob behaviour is often described as less intelligent and less rational than the behaviour of individuals.

Strong emotionality of crowds and their impulsiveness make people less sensitive to the rights and feelings of others and weaken their sense of social responsibility. That is why crowds are characterized by *irresponsibility*, and people behave in mobs as they never care to behave when they are alone. They have no inhibitions, no sentiments, and no regard for moral codes. Mobs violate moral laws and standards of decency, and indulge in activities which are unworthy of a rational and thoughtful person. We all know how infuriated mobs in industrial areas indulge in hooliganism and arson or how demonstrators on strikes in Calcutta set fire to trams and buses. Students during strike days resort to activities which are detrimental to their own interests. At some places they have damaged libraries and laboratories of their own institution.

This lack of responsibility in a crowd is due to 'fixation of attention and emotional excitement' which are easily exploited by a skilful orator. And once emotions are aroused all suggestions which fit in with the system of thought appealed to are readily welcomed. In crowds the individual loses his sense of responsibility both because responsibility is divided and because his behaviour is covered by anonymity. 'Lack of responsibility

and increase of suggestibility also account for the credulity of crowds. Their dogmatism and intolerance are due to the sense of omnipotence and the intensification of conviction characteristic of individuals *in crowds*'*

The same author has important observations to make on the behaviour of mobs. 'Further, protected by anonymity, people do not exercise as much control as usual and give free vein to the *expression of their feelings*. Hence the shouting, gesticulating, boisterous laughter, frantic cheers of the crowd and their tendency to extremes. These exaggerated reactions cannot but have their effect on already suggestible individuals and so the process of cumulative suggestion goes on. The peculiar feeling of irresponsibility on the part of the individual is furthered by anonymity, but is very likely also due to the illusion of omnipotence felt by people sharing in a great assembly.'†

These two characteristics of mob behaviour, *sense of all-powerfulness* and *of security in anonymity*, are in ample evidence in all types of mobs In a crowd individuals feel that they can do and achieve anything and no power can check them The fury of the aggressive mobs is quite well known. Secondly, they also feel that individuals are not responsible for the doings of the mob and at least they will not be found out and punished mostly because they do not know each other.

Explanation of mob behaviour

Why do individuals generally behave more emotionally in crowds than elsewhere? Why do so many people shout and cheer and contort themselves at football games, sometimes almost to the point of hysteria and exhaustion? These very individuals behave themselves more decorously in other places Certainly their mere assembly in a crowd has something to do with the intense behaviour.

We have already discussed in a previous chapter how Le Bon explains group behaviour by referring it to a collective or group mind which comes into being when a number of individuals are assembled together. In a crowd the individual yields to instincts which, had he been alone, he would have perforce kept under

*Morris Ginsberg, *The Psychology of Society* (London: Methuen & Co), p. 183.
†*Ibid.*

restraint. In a crowd every sentiment and act is contagious, so much so that an individual readily sacrifices his own interest to that of the group. Under the influence of suggestion he will undertake the accomplishment of certain acts with irresistible force. Thus Le Bon explains crowd emotionally in terms of heightened suggestibility, that is, the tendency of an individual in a crowd to respond uncritically to the stimuli provided by the other members, to make almost automatic responses to the wishes of others, particularly those in authority and those whom he respects or who has prestige for him, like a hypnotized person. Secondly, in a crowd the individual acquires solely from consideration of number, a sentiment of all-powerfulness which allows him to yield to instincts which he keeps under control when he is alone.

William McDougall who agrees with Le Bon in his interpretation of collective or group mind offers practically the same explanation of crowd behaviour. According to him a crowd is 'excessively emotional, impulsive, fickle, inconsistent, irresolute and extreme in action, displaying only the coarser emotions and the less refined sentiments, extremely suggestible, careless in deliberation, hasty in judgement, incapable of any but the simpler, and imperfect forms of reasoning; easily swayed and led, lacking in self-consciousness, devoid of self-respect and of sense of responsibility, and apt to be carried away by the consciousness of its own force, so that it tends to produce all the manifestations . . . of any irresponsible and absolute power. Hence its behaviour is like that of an unruly child or an untutored passionate savage in a strange situation and in the worst cases it is like a wild beast.'*

According to McDougall mob behaviour has three characteristics: (1) intellectual processes are inhibited in a crowd, (2) emotions are heightened, and (3) there is regression or relapse into instinctive activity. McDougall explains the first by the second —under the influence of strong emotions individuals lose the power of critical reasoning and losing the second slip into the emotions of others. Mutual interaction intensifies the collective emotion and the individual *surrenders* to the group. Unable to resist the authority of the group he lowers his level of intellectual responses.

*William McDougall, *Group Mind*, p. 31.

Both Le Bon and McDougall emphasize increased suggestibility, loss of restraint, hypnotic contagion, and the like leading to lowering of the moral and intellectual standards of the individual. E. D. Martin in his book *The Behaviour of Crowds* published in 1920, objects to the views of Le Bon and McDougall and offers a psychoanalytical interpretation of mob behaviour in which the restraints of the superego are relaxed and the individual yields to primitive impulses. Mob behaviour is a kind of temporary insanity which affects people herded together. Freud in his book *Group Psychology and Analysis of the Ego* traces intense emotionality of the mob to indirect impulses repressed in the unconscious and to the deeply buried racial mind. According to Le Bon and McDougall the mob is stupid and feeble-minded, and according to Freud and Martin it is insane and abnormal.

According to F. H Allport the explanation of mob behaviour *should be sought not in the crowd as a whole but in individual* impulses and responses. The fact of aggregation or assembling of people and their manipulation by a leader is not so important as the fact of their mutual interaction and interstimulation in which their responses are intensified. He used the concept of the *impression of universality* to explain the tendency of individuals to adopt the morality of the mob Seeing that everyone is running after a thief and crying for him the individual is led to believe that this is the right thing to do Miller and Dollard are also of the view that a mob carries the prestige of the number and individuals are led to believe that it cannot be wrong.

Earlier in describing the characteristics of crowd behaviour we have referred to its mental homogeneity This has been explained by a number of concepts like *imitation, suggestion or suggestibility*, emotional contagion McDougall explained it by primitive sympathy which is nothing more than a general way of putting the same thing over. Some social scientists explain mental and behaviour homogeneity by 'rapport' and 'circular reaction' But what is homogeneous about crowd behaviour? It is both stupid and emotional. F. H. Allport explains it by the concept of *social facilitation*, by which he meant the interactional process in which one individual is influenced by another There is ample evidence of the 'facilitating' effect of other people. We all eat much more when we are in company, our emotional experiences and expressions are fuller and stronger when others are participating

with us. Facilitation is a fundamental type of interaction. If Le Bon and McDougall have taken the extreme position of merging separate individuals into a superconscious group entity like collective or group mind, Allport has gone to the other extreme of stressing the individual too sharply against the group.

Allport maintains that as a result of the assembly of people individuals get the impression of vastness and strength of a mob and of its great prestige. This narrows his range of attention and creates the attitude of submission and conformity to mob behaviour. He does what others do in a mob because of this prestige and impression of universality. His behaviour in a crowd is not different from how he behaves when alone, only it is stronger and more intense.

There is no doubt that crowd behaviour is 'emergent' in the sense that it is different from other behaviour the individual is capable of. Close observation of mob violence or mob panic reveals that it is difficult to predict how crowds will behave. Even Allport who stresses individual factors in crowd behaviour concedes that 'nothing new or different was added by the crowd situation except an intensification of the feelings already present and the possibility of concerted action. The individual in the crowd behaves just as he would alone, *only more so*.'*

Sherif has pointed out that in intense group situations new norms and values arise and the individual has to conform to them. This conformity often has a demoralizing effect and individuals commit inhuman acts under the influence of mob violence and fury. On the other hand they may be inspired to deeds of heroism and self-sacrifice and their moral values may be raised higher. In the days of partition, Hindus and Muslims sank low to the level of beasts in killing, looting, and arson. But equally true it is that on both sides many good people suffered abuse and humiliation at the hands of their own community for giving food and shelter to members of the other community. Behaviour may be both higher and lower than that of the individual. This view of Sherif may help to correct the generally held belief that mob behaviour is always lower intellectually and morally.

Types of mobs

The classification of crowds and mobs as proposed by Brown

**Social Psychology*, p. 295.

has already been mentioned. We shall now discuss them in detail.

Some mobs are *aggressive*. They are action crowds whose goal is to do injury to some person. Detailed studies of the behaviour of aggressive mobs have been made in the United States, and Myrdal has distinguished mob violence into lynching, rioting, and terrorizing. There is hardly any case of lynching in India. Mahatma Gandhi was once threatened with lynching in South Africa, and in America mostly in southern states white people take the law into their own hands and beat down a Negro to death for some crime which the latter is supposed to have committed In milder form cases have occurred in Calcutta of large crowds of passers-by rushing at the driver of a bus guilty of a road accident resulting in death. But mob violence has seldom resulted in death However, in all such cases of illegal violent aggression the mob professes high moral purpose, and later their violent behaviour is justified by allegations of negligence and delay on the part of the police in bringing the culprit to book.

Rioting and terrorization are fairly common in our country. During the years of national struggle for freedom rioting took generally two forms. In the first place there were communal riots between Hindus and Muslims of a town, locality or area Usually Hindus were accused of playing music before mosques as when some marriage party or funeral procession passed by a mosque, or Muslims were accused of cow-slaughter. Their climax was seen in intercommunal massacres, looting and arson during days of partition in the Punjab and Bengal. Generally communal riots at one place led to communal riots at other places, and there was a chain reaction. Secondly, non-violent demonstrators often clashed with the police The latter feared that law and order would be disturbed by such demonstrations and tried to disperse crowds first by threats and gas and later by lathi-charges and even by gun-fire. Such rioting was often started by some miscreants throwing stones at the police or firing a cracker. After Independence riots have often taken place between student demonstrators and the police. In Uttar Pradesh student indiscipline is very rampant and for minor frustrations students go on strike and then take out processions. Such processions usually become unruly and take to violent activities like looting shops, pelting stones at the police or burning and damaging govern-

ment property. Student mobs may threaten police or the police may threaten students to disperse or try to disperse them by force. It is difficult to determine later as to who started the trouble but mutual recriminations follow. Terrorization is involved in all such rioting.

The *escape mob in panic* is fear-driven. Individuals in such a mob did not meet to show panic or experience fear. They had gathered together for some other purpose but suddenly there arose a situation in which at first they were taken by surprise or shocked, then they began to understand the dangerous situation and later sought some mode of adjustment to the danger. There is a sudden fire in a house or ship, the inmates have a sense of crisis and try to understand the situation. But somebody may shout 'fire', 'we are finished', 'oh god' and the like or some people may run crying. Such individuals usually become leaders or models to follow, they catch attention and their panicky behaviour spreads to others. Most of the social psychologists explain this mimicry by suggestion, imitation or contagion, but this mental homogeneity of panic mobs may take many forms. People in a house or fire may rush downstairs or jump from windows. In a ship they may jump into the sea. Or they may resort to collective suicide by staying calm awaiting the fire to overtake them.

Stories are often told of crew and passengers in a ship behaving in a very disciplined manner as an organized group in the face of a crisis and allowing and helping ladies and children to escape first. Accounts of the behaviour and bearing of British people during the German blitz and later when London and its surroundings were bombed have been made much of, but in the case of ships the naval tradition served to enforce discipline and call forth a spirit of self-sacrifice, and in the case of civilian population of London their organization into blocks under wardens was to some extent responsible for their orderly courage in facing the critical situation.

In fact, in times of crisis heroic leadership helps people in panic to rally and recover their sanity and strength. The leadership of Winston Churchill during the worst phase of World War II when London and other towns were being pounded by German bombs was one single factor saving the British population from panic and defeat.

The *acquisitive mobs* are centred on one specific object, as for example, the rush for food during food shortage, the run to banks to withdraw money or the surging crowd rushing to front seats at a variety show. There is something of a panic in such mobs because they are partly driven by the fear of losing what they wish to acquire. During the last year a number of commodities were in short supply like wheat, rice, sugar and pulses, and any slight whiff of rumour sent people rushing to the shops for their supplies. The more panicky and acquisitive they became the higher the prices rose. In many cases there was no short supply but the traders set afloat rumours, created panicky conditions and cashed on the acquisitive tendencies of the people.

Now such behaviour is neither illegal nor immoral but it shakes the stability of the economic and social structure and may create a law and order situation by actually leading to food shortage and spreading food riots The state agencies advise making small purchases according to daily or weekly needs, and starting co-operative stores. Both steps can stabilize prices and prevent food riots, but in the rush of panic people do not give credence to such advice, and selfish traders promote and intensify mob acquisitiveness

Lastly, there are the *expressive mobs*, that is, action crowds in which people join not because they want to injure someone, to escape a danger or to acquire something but just to give expression to their common emotions and to seek relief from the boredom and monotony of daily routine. The large mass of people on the beaches on holidays, the crowds in the Calcutta *maidan* on Sundays, the large number of men and women that rush and line up on the route of an eminent dignitary driving from the airport to the government house and cheer him, the crowds of young men dancing on the road to celebrate the victory of the Indian hockey team at Tokyo and the like are examples of expressive crowds. They need change, revelry, expression of pent up emotions, release of tensions produced by the daily routine. In the countryside we have rural fairs and festivals where people join in new clothes, purchase fanciful things, and sing and dance their time away. At the time of a marriage many families have wild parties and sprees, and many communities celebrate marriages with night-long programmes of group

singing, dancing and drinking. These are all expressive groups free from aggression, escape and acquisition, which characterize other types of mobs.

Among Hindus many people join religious congregations to shout religious slogans or sing devotional songs. In the past they would go to Hardwar, Allahabad or Varanasi in large groups, forming processions and singing songs. The Kumbh Mela is also an expressive mob. The emotions they feel when they shout 'victory to mother Ganges' and the excited behaviour accompanying them are characteristic of the expressive mob, and would not be found in individuals when they are alone.

Audiences

Audiences are distinguished into informal and highly casual, such as the gathering of people in the street around a flute player or a juggler or the crowd that gathers round a policeman when he has caught a thief, and the more formal and scheduled audience such as the crowd which assembles to watch a film show or to listen to a lecture. Casual audiences gather spontaneously and accidentally. A motor-car arrives in a village and women and children gather round it just as a camel in a metropolitan locality attracts a crowd of townspeople. Such audiences are not organized, their programme is not regulated. In social psychology we are concerned only with formal scheduled audiences which gather for a definite purpose and at a predetermined time and place.

Kimball Young mentions three chief characteristics of a formal audience: (1) It has a specific purpose about which most of the members have already been informed, (2) It meets at a predetermined time and place which have also been notified, and (3) It has a standard form of polarization and interaction, that is, people already know who will perform, speak or lead, who will watch, listen or follow, and how the two parties will react to each other. The person of the leader is designated, and the number of seats, the seating plan and the distance between seats are physical features which help the polarization. In many audiences the situation is highly conventional, the reactions of the people are highly standardized and the whole programme is institutionalized. At a prize distribution in a school or at a university convocation what will be spoken by the people seated

on the stage, what people will do, and the order of the several items in the programme are pre-arranged. The audience is well prepared to accept the leadership of the person who presides that he needs little effort to dominate them. Maintaining leadership in such a situation is easy and simple. The audience is easily satisfied and the leader need not be particularly forceful, clever or eloquent. In most of the formal audiences, therefore, the cultural influence is at work. Some audiences merely give a mild clap of hands, others give prolonged cheers, and still others get up from their seats and shout in applause.

Different methods are used to gather people in audiences. For highly academic lectures notices may be printed in newspapers, for popular lectures handbills may be distributed, for election meetings the announcements may be made by the beat of the drum or by loudspeakers placed in a jeep, and the people may be drawn by film records played on loudspeakers The cinema-house manager may get the picture reviewed in the papers, provide preview for heads of educational institutions and pressmen or get coloured posters fixed at prominent places in the town All these techniques are employed and they differ with the different types of audiences to be gathered.

In every audience there are two types of interaction: one between the leader and the people assembled to watch, listen or follow him, and the other between members of the audience themselves.

Kimball Young speaks of three types of audiences; those which seek information, those which seek to be persuaded and converted, and those which seek entertainment and recreation We shall now discuss them briefly.

Audience seeking information

Such an audience will be found in the lecture of a scientist, philosopher, or statesman who may provide information or give new interpretation Such lectures are arranged in a quiet sober place for a select audience. The aim of the lecture is not to win over people nor to entertain them but to add to their stock of information. New facts or ideas are put across to the audience and they are left to think for themselves A scientist may propound a new theory or describe his experimental investigation; a philosopher may put forward a new point of view about some

of the problems of life and the world; a statesman may bring out the implications of, and reasons for, a new policy or a new measure taken by the government or analyse an emergency facing the nation. The speaker may read a manuscript, speak from notes or speak freely from memory. The last method helps in effecting a *rapport* between the speaker and his audience which other methods fail to achieve. At many audiences the paper or the address to be read is distributed beforehand and the audience follow it as it is being read.

The information audience aims at seeking understanding and the speaker will do well to use such aids as will facilitate understanding.

The press conference of a prime minister or an eminent spokesman of the government is also an audience of this type.

It is very helpful for better understanding if the lecture or statement of the speaker is followed by questions and answers or a general discussion. Such a procedure clears doubts and difficulties of people, and at a press conference press people ask supplementaries to bring out the finer shades of meaning and implications of the statements made by the speaker.

Many audiences of the intellectual type really enjoy lectures or science papers as they would enjoy a film show, and describe lectures or papers by eminent leaders or scientists as a great treat. It is mainly because of their own profound interest in the subject of the lecture and the clear presentation of the speaker. Such audiences become then recreational audiences to some extent.

Conversional audience

Such audiences seek to be persuaded and converted to a new approach, a new way of thinking and feeling. Emotional appeals are very common at such audiences and their programmes are either religious or political. The statesman speaking about his policies and programmes in a university, a college, or a party meeting may be giving information and ideas only for the understanding of his listeners, but while addressing a large crowd in a maidan may resort to emotional appeals and try to convert the audience to support his policies and programmes. The religious leader will try to persuade people to adopt his way of worship or creed. Both audiences are roused in the first instance to think

and feel in the same way as the leader does and later on to act according to his political or religious creed.

In such audiences there is shoulder-to-shoulder contact and often people are asked to sing a national or devotional song in chorus to break down barriers of status differences and to produce group cohesion. Such mass singing also paves the way for establishing rapport between the speaker and his audience and helps to make the latter's emotional appeals more effective. Mahatma Gandhi's audiences were both religious and political and his appeal was aimed at making listeners better persons and persuading them to take keener and more active interest in national struggle and activity But then Gandhian approach was unique giving national struggle and service a religious fervour and seeking the solution of political problems and ills on an ethical basis Hitler, Jinnah and Lloyd George were highly effective with conversional audiences and could rouse people to strong emotions and intense activity along their own lines of thinking

Recreational audience

Such an audience seeks amusement and entertainment. In India a snake-charmer, a monkey-man, a juggler or an acrobat can easily attract a small crowd at any street corner. Such a crowd assembles spontaneously just for the fun of watching a show, and beating the drum is enough to bring them together. Audiences at a theatre, cinema-house or musical programme or variety show are recreational. People go there to enjoy and relax and they pay for the privilege to be there But most of them have their own expectations of the show and are very critical if their expectations are not fulfilled Cinema audiences have their own favourite film stars, they have formed certain tastes about music, dance and story, and if their sensibility is in any way offended they hiss and boo. Film producers are very careful that they pander to the tastes of that class of population which frequents the cinema-houses, and if the intelligentsia complain that the standard of films is falling, producers pay no heed to it knowing full well that such people do not matter much They seem to know their audiences and go on repeating the same formula of triangles in film stories The new film should be new and different and yet must conform to the public conventions and expectations. That is why films do not deviate much in cast,

music, dances and story. Quite a few films which have struck a new line have become flops. In every cinema audiences are found a few individuals who go on criticizing the film during the show. They do not seem to be seeking recreation.

Theatre audiences are more critical. While old plays may be accepted and only their cast and performance is commented upon new plays may or may not prove effective in audience leadership. A good play may be spoiled by a bad cast and a bad play may be redeemed by a good cast. Audience satisfaction depends on a number of factors which are not all under the control of the producer.

Rumours

In mass behaviour rumours play a very effective part in rousing people to action. A rumour is a simple story attached to some actual rather than fictitious person or to some actual rather than some imaginary event which grows as its spreads. Kimball Young thinks it is a kind of suggestion which beginning as a simple fact or supposition in time may become elaborated into a highly emotional story of great significance. Rumours spread as the result of initiative of so many individuals that it is difficult to predict about them. They are short-lived but can sometimes do great damage. Rumour is a kind of communication which is interesting in itself but which may lead to large-scale panic or violence on the part of the masses.

Rumours originate in gossip and spread by word of mouth, by letters or telephonic messages or by telegrams. Often newspapers are responsible for starting and spreading them. Characters, events and situations are distorted by just reporting 'It is rumoured that...'. Some journals specialize in such news and reports and command a great sale because they make them spicy in utter disregard of truth. They are described as 'yellow journalism'.

In times of crises rumours spread very rapidly and cause considerable damage. During the war, particularly during the war years of 1940's, all sorts of unfounded rumours spread quickly and were readily accepted. People were nervous and jittery and were willing to believe almost anything. Several stories went round about Churchill and Roosevelt and people had heard them from a friend of a friend of high personages. During the days

of partition and of the Chinese invasion in 1962 all sorts of rumours went round describing the bungling of the government. Many rumours were vicious and intentionally circulated to provoke action on the part of the masses. 'Fifth Column' rumours were spread to demoralize people and weaken popular support to the war effort.

Rumours thrive on ignorance and lack of accurate information. That is why all governments are keen on organizing information centres, spreading correct news about events and exercising control over newspapers and broadcasting agencies. Sometimes very fantastic stories are woven out of simple facts and the more the government agencies repudiate them the more strongly they are believed on the plea that the government is deliberately hiding facts and misleading the public.

Rumours to be effective and successful must be very briefly expressed. They must be concrete and explicit and they must be about familiar persons, places and situations. They must also be incapable of verification, offering inside information and appealing to the wishes and fears of a large number of people.

When the United States entered World War II all sorts of rumours spread, and in order to contradict them or to find out their source many 'rumour clinics' were set up in large towns. G. Allport, and later L. Postman, undertook several experimental studies. According to them the most important features of a rumour are importance and ambiguity. When food prices go up, all sorts of rumours about hoarding, black-marketing and state bungling are set afloat. They succeed because the food problem is very important and affects everybody, and as the government takes time to find out facts before clarifying the position the situation grows uncertain and ambiguous. The two authors of *The Psychology of Rumour* have studied in detail how rumours are transmitted and what tendencies or processes influence the content of rumour.

Earlier in the chapter we have pointed out the growing tendency of people to migrate to towns and the rapid emergence of mass society in which social norms and face-to-face intimate relations do not exist. In such a society rumours thrive and play havoc with national morale and social security. Mass hysteria is often the result of such rumours. Recently everybody has been thinking and talking about corruption in high places and

all sorts of stories about the fabulous wealth accumulated by eminent people are current coin. In Delhi rumours about insects being found in aerated water bottles spread like wild fire, they were magnified and some business houses had to close down. In villages rumours about ghosts and man-eaters make the life of people miserable. In the midst of a severe crisis even sane normal people fall an easy prey to rumours.

Other features of mass behaviour will be treated in the next chapter.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDIES

YOUNG, K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.).

LINDZEY, G. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.).

SPROTT, G. *Human Groups* (Penguin).

LAPIERE and FARNSWORTH, *Social Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc.).

BIRD, C. *Social Psychology* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co.).

CHAPTER XVII

FASHIONS, FADS AND CRAZES

IN THIS chapter we shall consider some more features of mass behaviour which are very important even though transitory and changing. They are fashions, fads and crazes.

Fashions

The term fashion is often used indiscriminately to denote any change in modes of dress and adornment, of decoration and furniture and of other types of social expressions or in styles of houses, cars, music, art and other areas of culture But it should be used only for those changes which are current, prevailing and accepted. That is why to be in fashion gives an individual a status or prestige in any society. Wearing clothes of the latest fashion, having latest hair styles or using new type of furniture is a bid for leadership in person-to-person relations, and often people are marked out for disapproval for clinging to old styles or modes of dress, hair style or furniture.

Kimball Young defines fashion 'as the current or prevailing usage, mode, manner or characteristic expression, presentation or conception of those particular cultural traits which custom itself allows to change.'* LaPiere and Farnsworth restrict the use of the term fashion to 'changes in modes of dress'. But whatever the way in which the term is defined and whatever aspect of it is stressed there is no dispute about the fact that fashions represent short-lived, superficial, rapid departures from the customary patterns or modes of behaviour. Secondly, fashions are essentially a modern phenomenon. In olden times customs and traditions ruled supreme, people were divided into castes and classes, there was an hierarchy of status and each class was known by its prescribed modes of speech, dress, houses, furniture, music or means of transport. Social control and pressure

**Handbook of Social Psychology*, p. 411.

was so rigid and powerful that there was no room for quick changes or fashions. In rural communities the same thing holds good and people in the countryside continue to dress, eat and sing in the manner in which they have been doing for ages. In static societies there is no room for fashion. But in modern industrialized communities change is the law of life and fashions come and go in quick succession. In large modern towns like London, Paris, New York or Bombay the élite may seem to be doing nothing but following the latest fashions.

Fashions and customs

Customs are usually thought of as folkways and mores which are more or less well established and difficult to change, and folkways which come and go frequently are called fashions. Morris Ginsberg expresses the distinction admirably:

> It is sometimes said that fashion is simultaneous conformity in action, i.e. under its influence each person does what everyone else is doing, and is thus based on imitation; while custom is successive conformity; in other words, when acting in accordance with custom, each person does what has always been done, and it is thus based essentially on habit. But there are more important distinguishing features. In the first place, custom seems to be concerned with constant and fundamental needs of society, while fashion or vogue seems to affect less vital and less general spheres of life. Fashion is essentially evanescent and changeable. It is in fact a series of recurring changes often marked by rhythmic imitation and innovation. Custom, on the other hand, is essentially enduring and continuous, and subject only to slow change. Of course there are some fashions which do not change, but in so far as that is the case, they have really passed into custom; in other words, they have the prestige of the past as well as that of the present. In the second place, there would appear to be a total difference of motive between custom and fashion. Neither can be adequately characterized by mere uniformity of action, because there are many uniform actions based on instinct or hereditary structure generally. But while custom is followed because it has generally been followed in the past, fashion is followed because it is now generally followed. Further, in a sense fashion makes for novelty, and its essential basis is to be found in the passion for self-individualization or differentiation. Custom, on the other hand, owes much of its force to the fact that through it society has warded off the dangers of novelty. Thus 'custom' imitation and 'mode' imitation work in different directions. The one tends to perpetuate and stereotype the old; the other to bring in innovations and to spread them by imitation.*

**Psychology of Society*, pp. 107-08.

Customs begin to influence individual behaviour from early childhood but it is only in adolescence that fashions begin to operate. Old age seems to be immune from the influence of fashions.

Fashions are socially accepted norms which are changing frequently, and as has been pointed out above, they thrive best in cosmopolitan areas of large towns where the current of life flows fast and in turbulent eddies To be fashionable is to be modern and up-to-date, beating time and custom.

Some social scientists observe that fashions change in cycles; they come and go, and come again. Male trousers used to be worn narrow, then they changed into larger width and today they are being worn in 'drain-pipe' width. It may be, as LaPiere suggests, that the possibilities of change are restricted by the structure of the human body Such 'cyclic' changes in fashions are found in abundance in the dress, hair-styles and ornaments of ladies. Blouses have changed forms and styles so often coming back to old ones again and again

With the growth of industrialization the conformity producing power of customs has weakened Every society is made up of many different groups. There are different religious communities—Hindus, Muslims, Christians and others, each community is divided into numerous castes and classes each of which is further divided into groups based on professions and occupations There are 'society' women, housewives and working women There are religious groups, artists' clubs, merchants' chamber and the like In such a heterogeneous society it is difficult to maintain conformity and customs do not hold so important a place as they did in old agrarian society.

Customs and fashions represent stability and change in society Since some changes may become permanent some fashions though they are fugitive short-lived patterns of behaviour may become universal and permanent Since Independence many fashions in the celebration of Hindu marriages in northern India have become customs and have acquired the force of compulsion found in well established customs Changes in customs are slow but changes in fashions, at least in our times, tend to be rapid Because changes in fashion are quick it should not be assumed that their conformity producing power is in any case less The dictates of fashion can be equally severe In fact the dominance of

fashion over a good deal of our behaviour is everywhere in evidence.

Changes in fashions

The sweep of fashions is very wide, there is hardly any class in society which is not sensitive to fashions and their changes and in our times fashion has become democratized, that is, fashions of socially high and financially outstanding people filter down to masses. 'What today the upper class woman has designed in the way of the latest style, tomorrow has reached the middle class market, and the day after tomorrow the mass buyer of petty bourgeois status or below'.* This process of percolation has been observed and stressed by several social psychologists. High society acts as the pace-setter in fashions for the masses. In Europe as in the Orient royal courts used to set fashions for high society to follow but they seldom reached the masses. Today courts are almost extinct, and fashions are set by dress designers in metropolitan cities and sold to people of means, but later the demands of mass buyers play an important part in producing cheaper models, and the designs are manufactured more cheaply to be sold to middle and lower classes. Large-scale production of ready-made clothes has made it all the easier. Even otherwise what designs and patterns of clothes are in vogue in Bombay, Calcutta and Delhi soon reach small towns and then still smaller towns.

But sometimes fashions are not set by the so-called high society, and are copied by the higher from the lower strata of society. For example the backless choli worn by ultra-modern ladies of today were worn by working women in rural areas of Rajasthan and Gujarat. But it may be due less to imitation of the lower strata and more to the desire to look different and to exhibit as much of the physical form as can be decently done.

Perhaps the moot point is that nowadays fashions do not depend on the high and the rich and everybody can be fashionable if he so chooses irrespective of his or her social and financial status. Technological advances in mass production have made consumers' goods cheap and facilitated mass buying. Fashions are now matters of form and style and not of material

*K. Young, *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.), p. 314.

value. This has shifted fashion leadership from the aristocrats to designers, manufacturers and distributors who through exhibitions, shop-windows and attractive models influence styles and vogues at any given time. Paris designers of ladies' draperies are well known, but in our own country important cloth mills have very attractive showrooms and organize glamorous exhibitions to publicize their sarees and dress material patterns. In this respect the showrooms of the handloom products have played no insignificant part. Commercial profit motive is no less powerful in popularizing new patterns and designs.

In the West royal princes and princesses greatly influenced fashion. Some of them have passed into history for having popularized a particular kind and design of apparel. In our own times Albert Edward (later Edward VII) was responsible for introducing what was known as the Prince Albert coat for standard and proper dress. The Duke and Duchess of Windsor influenced fashions in male and female dress. In our own country Mughal princes and princesses were responsible for many designs and patterns in dress, perfumes, foods and buildings. In our own times Nehru introduced what is known as the Jawahar jacket and Mahatma Gandhi popularized the Gandhi cap.

Nowadays film stars too are responsible for some fashions. Young people have their favourite stars and try to dress like them. At one time Dilip Kumar hair-style was popular among young men and recently the Dev Anand style has replaced it. The drain-pipe trousers and open-collar loose shirt too must have come from the films.

Some fashions spread very quickly in all countries mostly because the means of transport and communication are very quick and there is a much more frequent intercourse between countries. The bush-shirt or bush-coat originating in the United States spread to all countries of the world in much less time. So did the 'Bikini' bathing suit. The bush-shirt emanated from the people's desire to imitate the military types of clothes, and the beauty contests brought the 'Bikini' into prominence. The spread of fashions is vastly facilitated by mass production and transportation of goods, and the quick communication either personally or by correspondence from the centres of fashion to the remotest parts of the world. These facilities for production, transportation, and communication have led to large-scale invest-

ments in the manufacture and distribution of fashionable goods. Because profits in such business are very high; commercial organizations too are greatly interested in the changes in fashions and help or conspire to bring about quick changes.

It has been pointed out above that the rapid changes in fashions is a modern phenomenon. In Europe the Renaissance awakened a desire for new and different things and opened to society a new world offering full play to likes and choices. The Industrial Revolution completed this process of liberation and the rise of democratic ideas and the common people increased manifold the number of people who could be influenced by fashion and who were willing to be fashionable. In India the forces of emancipation started working under the impact of Western civilization and education and they had free play during our national struggle and in post-Independence years paving the way for wide variety of possible choices and for rapid changes in fashions in all areas of dress, food, manners, music, art and what not.

Fashion and culture

Fashion occurs within the context of a certain culture and cannot go against the mores and norms of that culture even though all fashions are departures from what was customary. In some societies there is little or no permissiveness to effect changes in clothes, food, manner, housing, decorations, and the like. In such static social structures the rôle of fashion is very small if any at all. In the Middle Ages women in Europe were expected to be covered from head to foot—skirts rolled down to the floor, sleeves were full and the entire upper part of the bust was covered except for the face. There were numerous class distinctions—princesses and queens had veils from head to foot while ordinary women had veils up to the waist. But changes in cultural patterns have brought about changes in fashions. With the emancipation of women their dress designs have given greater airing to their physical body. Skirts, blouses and sleeves have been growing shorter. In England people are more formal than people in the United States or France, and the upper class Englishmen dress for dinner. The semi-nude fashions prevailing in the West do not find favour with Indians in. whose culture modesty is a very much prized virtue. Young school girls do

take to skirt and blouse during school days but except in large towns the skirt and blouse dress has not made much headway. Girls discard them as soon as they enter college or grow up, and take to saree or salwar-kameez.

From the Middle Ages, laws against indecent clothes have been enacted from time to time and cultural disapproval of uncovering the neck, bosom and legs. Moralists and priests denounced all such dress which showed legs, neck, bosom and arms as indecent. The length of the skirt has always been a subject of controversy till recently. Puritans and their tribe always carried a campaign against the so-called indecent dress or the use of personal adornments. In India some decades back the use of elaborate make-up among ladies was frowned upon, particularly among unmarried girls, and recently in one of the states, government sent a circular to all educational institutions to discourage the use of tight clothes which showed body contours.

Similarly, smoking and drinking among women looked immoral in the West some centuries back but is unnoticed today. In India it is still frowned upon. In some countries like Russia and Japan men and women may bathe together naked without exciting comment. Such a thing cannot even be thought of in India. In the West and even in India leaders and eminent statesmen appear in public with their wives and are photographed together but in Muslim countries no such thing is possible.

Fashions present a phenomenon of change against a background of stability, and cultural norms always fight against them though sometimes they fight a losing battle In our own times ideas of freedom and independence have affected all areas of life and behaviour and therefore there is a greater breakaway from customs and traditions In such a climate fashions have had greater influence on people. Again in our own times there is greater and more frequent intercourse between racial, national, religious and geographical groups, and this leads to more frequent and rapid changes in fashions

•

Men and fashion

The peacock view of the male role is widely held and it is believed that in the olden times the male was the ornate sex But in modern times not many significant changes have taken place in the male attire. No doubt in pre-British days the aristo-

crats and Nawabs were as keenly interested in fashion and its changes, but with the advent of industrial and social revolution in the country particularly after World War I changes in male dress have been minor. With the spread of Western education more people have taken to coat and pant, but changes in fashion have been confined to shortening of shirt-collar, shortening of the jacket and the style of trousers which have alternated between short and wide, narrow and long, and wide and long. Shoes too have seen many changes; once boots were popular, later we had oxford shoes and now we have sandals and shoes with pointed toes. There have been changes in material also. After Independence closed-collar coats and sherwanis and achkans are more popular. On the whole male fashions move toward greater uniformity in clothes. Sports dress may have bright colours but clothes for daily wear continue to be of subdued colours. Some years ago there was a sharp controversy in a Calcutta daily about men wearing dull drab clothes during summer and it was started by a woman correspondent who argued that men should dress attractively as women do.

The very slow changes in male dress have been attributed to a number of causes. In the first place it is argued that men are generally conservative in dress and appearance and are not inclined to show off. Men are supposed to be men and the image of masculinity in every modern culture rules out frivolous display of colour and novelty. Secondly, men have to work and only certain styles suit them. Thirdly, there is among men a strong desire to conform and to avoid being too different and therefore conspicuous. During times of emergency men's clothes have shown a tendency toward military pattern but otherwise for the last half century or so men have worn practically the same style of clothes.

Women and fashion

Fashion by common consent seems to be the special domain of women. Indeed women's fashions have been the subject of amusement among men and the rapidity with which they change are the theme of many club jokes. The changing fashions among women have already been described in detail and it may be stressed here that while men cling to more or less uniform patterns of dress the range of variability in dress among women is very large. Men dress alike but hardly any two women re-

semble in dress material or design. In fact women are particular that they should be wearing those designs and patterns which are new and different from others. This desire to be different is very strong among women. Men are inclined to be casual *but not women.* Women are much more particular as to how they look because of the special role they are called upon to play in the present-day civilization. A woman pleases by what she is and what she looks rather than by what she does. For ages she has done that. Whether it is due to her biological make-up or to historical factors her role is subordinate to, and dependent on, men; her social status is determined by her personal relations and sexual behaviour; *and she is forever trying to prove* her desirability by resorting to new fashions and reaffirming her attractiveness Among rich and middle class families women are considered a luxury involving a good deal of expense and young men go in for marriage only when they can afford it. Every woman is a symbol of the social and economic status of her husband and therefore every man wishes his wife to dress and appear much higher than his means can afford In such a context women in our times have to be extravagant in dress, cosmetics and ornaments and to be affected by changes in fashions

Again women's sphere is primarily in the home. They have to make the home sweet and attractive, and being a more enduring part of the home than men they must make themselves sweet and attractive Fashions and their changes are one of the means by which they do so Some women these days are obliged to seek employment outside the home. Career women have come to compete with men in all areas of life and work, and their styles of dress are affected by conditions under which they work and by fashions prevailing among their colleagues

In the past leaders of fashion among women were ladies of the court and princesses Today film stars set the pace of fashions in dress, hair-do's and ornaments

Social and economic factors in fashion

There is no rationality about fashions and changes in fashions. There is no arguing about fashions. Nevertheless certain social and economic factors do influence fashions. The nationalist movement in India has helped popularity of handloom cloth and stimulated the creation of new designs in sarees and dress mate-

India. Today handlooms are a great rage and showrooms in large towns are doing roaring trade. Fantastic designs have attracted even eminent leaders in society like Queen Elizabeth II and Mrs. Kennedy (now Mrs. Onasis). Similarly, after Independence the desire to have a distinctive national dress for formal occasions led to closed-collar coat and pant for office dress and of black coat or achkan for ceremonial dinners.

Some people accept the prevailing fashions and then rationalize their acceptance by pointing out how useful the new changes are. The bush-shirt is very much commended as an economical item of our dress replacing both coat and shirt and as more useful and comfortable in summer. But more often that is an afterthought. People took to bush-shirts because others were doing it, that is, because it was the latest fashion in male dress. Still economic factors do affect fashions. The fashion of short skirt was greatly strengthened by the consideration that it would cost less. Terylene wash-and-wear garments are all the rage today because they save time and expense in washing and ironing. In the South, ladies used to wear a nine-yard sari and now they are [illegible] to a six-yard sari partly because it [illegible] cheaper

old style of dress, the old songs and sports. However most people, particularly women, do conform to prevailing fashions and the question is why they do so.

Some argue that fashion concerns itself with the ego closely and because dress and ornaments are symbols of the ego, being so close to the body, fashions express themselves more strongly in dress and ornaments. But there are fashions in furniture, architecture, music and amusements, and it is very difficult to restrict the range of fashions to any one area of life.

According to Kimball Young, 'One of the most interesting aspects of fashion with regard to personality is that it provides a nice interplay between the sense of individualism and difference on the one hand, and the social conformity which is imperative if one is to be in style, on the other.' This is a matter of common experience that if one is dressed in the latest fashion he is looked upon with feelings of admiration and envy, he is satisfied with himself if not actually delighted, and he breathes greater self-confidence. On the other hand if an individual is wearing an outmoded dress no longer in vogue he feels ill at ease and diffident and thinks that other people are looking at him with disdain. An individual dressed in the latest style is readily accepted by others while one who is dressed in an [illegible] manner is not so accepted. Two tendencies come into play in this phenomenon of fashion, one is the tendency and the desire to be different from others, to be isolated and marked out, to be distinguished from the crowd and to be unique, and the other is to be united and associated with others, to be accepted as doing the same thing which others are doing and to be supported by others. As Kimball Young puts it succinctly, 'Thus fashion furnishes for the personality a nice balance between the desire for conformity, security, and social solidarity, and the desire for distinction, individuality, and differentiation. The whole sway of fashion is related to the disturbance of the ever shifting balance of individualism and conformity.'*

In discussing the psychology of fashions people have been led to analyse the motives for wearing clothes. One of the [illegible] views is that people use clothes to protect their bodies. This may be true in the case of people living in [illegible] but people over-dress themselves even in tropical regions. And why

*Handbook of Social Psychology, p. [illegible]

do people use such items of dress as have no protection value? The utility motive in dress is not supported by history, and modern ideas of health certainly advocate radical reduction in clothing. In fact the trend toward light clothing is increasing. Another view is that man clothes his body out of a sense of shame. It is immodest to go about naked, and many social thinkers and laymen stress that modesty has an innate basis and that young people instinctively learn to cover their sex organs. The question of modesty is so linked with cultural learning that numerous controversies have ranged as to what part or parts of the body should be covered and how much they should be covered. Still another view is that people put on clothes to show off, to attract attention and impress others or to excite jealousy and envy among one's fellow-beings. This may be true about many people, but the number of people who wish to avoid being too conspicuous and therefore to wear common styles is also very large. Some ladies in India dress very gaudily and some are very keen to avoid showy designs and colours.

If we consider how carefully people dress themselves for formal occasions like marriages, state dinners, presentations at the Rashtrapati Bhavan, how meagerly they are dressed in summer in their own homes often putting on nothing except a dhoti, how ladies and gentlemen lie about on the beaches almost naked or how men and women wrap mufflers and rugs round their bodies during travel in winter, we will have no hesitation in concluding that human motivation in wearing clothes is complex, and fashions and fashion changes are based on psychology which is neither simple nor easy to follow. All that is possible is to emphasize some of the important motives in fashions.

In the first place the desire for changing fashions may mean eagerness to discard the old styles with which we are fed up and to follow the new and different styles. With changing seasons and circumstances we change quite a number of things of daily use. It may be a reaction to boredom or a wish to seek social approval. Ideas of display and of covering up physical defects may also be present. Many ladies take to high-heeled shoes to compensate their short stature just as many lean young men get the shoulders of their coats padded to look athletic.

Many fashions we follow because they are being followed by people whom we admire. Prestige, suggestion and imitation

play a powerful role in fashion changes. But these changes cannot be too radical nor depart violently from current accepted usage. Too often people select those patterns and styles of clothes which are popular.

Fashion is also a means of compensation for our inferiorities and inadequacies. A sense of inferiority is very unpleasant and many people dissolve it by seeking admiration and prominence through the use of latest fashions. Even unimportant persons gain prominence by dressing very fashionably.

Fads

The term fad' has been variously defined. According to Kimball Young it is 'a custom, amusement or vogue in dress or decoration that is followed for a time with an exaggerated zeal.' Doob understands by the word fad a 'rapid but usually temporary adoption of new habits by large groups of people' Some social psychologists use the terms *fad fashion* and *craze* interchangeably. A fad is a trivial deviation from usual behaviour. It is unstable and unorganized though occasionally it may become a permanent part of our culture Fads may become fashions when they grow more intense more enduring and more popular. But they all refer to temporary crowd behaviour. Sun-bathing, eating green vegetables, nudism, bananas with bed tea, morning walk, fatless diet, crossword puzzles, addressing Indian parents as daddy and mummy even in non-English speaking homes are examples of fads

Some fads emerge from certain 'cults particularly in food and exercise. Vegetarianism in several forms like eating green vegetables, taking fruit juices, living exclusively on milk, abstaining from water during lunch and dinner catches some people's fancy for some time just as sun-bathing, standing on one's head, deep-breathing or climbing become popular for some time and then disappear. Nature cure methods have spread several fads though this in no way is a reflection on their efficacy Some fads are spasmodic, that is, they spread very suddenly and quickly and disappear equally suddenly and quickly such as Hoola [illegible] rings, hair styles of film stars Usually there is some [illegible] behind 'cultist' fads

Fads also appear in special fields such as art and [illegible] Cubism and impressionism are examples of fads in [illegible]

Fads are most prevalent among adolescents. Jeans, drain-pipe trousers, pony-tails, one-piece short coats, steel bangles, straw hats are common fads of teenagers. College boys and girls also share some of these fads and have added some to them such as bizzare modes of dress, mannerisms in gait and talk or hair styles. They spread and disappear quite rapidly, and are difficult to explain.

Fads are sometimes means of getting entry into a group or set. In some groups women are eager to have fair skin to indicate that they belong to a higher social class, while in others fair skin people wish to have a good sun tan so that they may claim to belong to a leisure class which visits beaches for getting a good tan. At present in India many half-educated people carry on conversation in a mixture of English and vernacular words to prove their English education.

Fads are not recognized as fads if we are involved in them. It is only by looking back on them that we are able to recognize them for what they were. There is an element of emotion and irrationality in fads, and those who are not caught by fads usually look down upon or ridicule faddists.

Fads have been described as temporary and unstable but some of them spread widely and last longer and become fashions. Then they are socially acceptable and become a part of our culture.

The rise and fall of fads follows a normal curve. At first there is a rapid increase in their popularity till a peak is reached and then there is an equally rapid decline. Some writers who have made a study of fads are of the opinion that most fads in the country last about a year.

The spread of fads must be dependent on certain specific conditions. It is obvious that many factors are involved. In the first place every fad to be popular must seem new. It may have been in vogue in the past but people must have forgotten it. Today they must consider it as new and different. Second, it must be appropriate to the time and place. During days of Partition people in the Punjab could not think of taking to fads nor could Bengalis think of them during the days of famine. Hoola Hoop would catch in large towns but not in small villages. Third, though fads do not live long and cannot be predicted, advertising and propaganda help to spread them. Pictures

of styles of fads in clothes, for example, help to make fads reach a large number of people. And if with the help of publicity fads are widely accepted for long they become fashions, as for example bobbed hair, slacks, no headgear for men.

Crazes

Crazes are generated as quickly as the fad but they collapse very suddenly. The area of behaviour that is involved in a craze is very much limited but the people are very strongly affected, more emotionally involved and spend disproportionately larger time in their crazy activity. Such activities are feverish and time-consuming, and they spread like wildfire. 'Rock and roll' was a craze sometime back as was chain-letters. R. W. Brown calls it a 'mass folly', it is a mental epidemic.

A craze is more trivial than a fad, and has serious personal and social consequences.

Chain-letter crazes have prospered in America. You receive a letter in which you are asked to write the same letter to five of your friends. You have to send 10 cents to the person who sends you the letter, omit his name and put in your own. In course of time you will receive 10 cents from others. The list will increase and you are promised a large sum. In India some religious minded persons started such chains and promised religious salvation to people. Thousands of people fell for the appeal.

The story of the Elvis Presley craze is well known. He was all the rage in America during 1956-57. A guitar-playing 'rock-and-roll' singer this 21-year-old young man became an international figure. Wherever he went teenagers went crazy and shouted for him. They doted on all he was, had and said. Parents, clergymen and leaders were alarmed at the great influence and magic he exercised over young people sending them into hysteria of screeching and wailing. Businessmen were not slow to exploit his popularity and sold millions worth articles in his name.

Several studies have been made of crazes. A dynamic society is more craze-ridden than one in which customs and traditions rule supreme. When changes in society are rapid and frequent, when the wisdom of ancestors is discounted and when norms and values are in a fluid state crazes are common and strong.

Fads are most prevalent among adolescents. Jeans, drain-pipe trousers, pony-tails, one-piece short coats, steel bangles, straw hats are common fads of teenagers. College boys and girls also share some of these fads and have added some to them such as bizzare modes of dress, mannerisms in gait and talk or hair styles. They spread and disappear quite rapidly, and are difficult to explain.

Fads are sometimes means of getting entry into a group or set. In some groups women are eager to have fair skin to indicate that they belong to a higher social class, while in others fair skin people wish to have a good sun tan so that they may claim to belong to a leisure class which visits beaches for getting a good tan. At present in India many half-educated people carry on conversation in a mixture of English and vernacular words to prove their English education.

Fads are not recognized as fads if we are involved in them. It is only by looking back on them that we are able to recognize them for what they were. There is an element of emotion and irrationality in fads, and those who are not caught by fads usually look down upon or ridicule faddists.

Fads have been described as temporary and unstable but some of them spread widely and last longer and become fashions. Then they are socially acceptable and become a part of our culture.

The rise and fall of fads follows a normal curve. At first there is a rapid increase in their popularity till a peak is reached and then there is an equally rapid decline. Some writers who have made a study of fads are of the opinion that most fads in the country last about a year.

The spread of fads must be dependent on certain specific conditions. It is obvious that many factors are involved. In the first place every fad to be popular must seem new. It may have been in vogue in the past but people must have forgotten it. Today they must consider it as new and different. Second, it must be appropriate to the time and place. During days of Partition people in the Punjab could not think of taking to fads nor could Bengalis think of them during the days of famine. Hoola Hoop would catch in large towns but not in small villages. Third, though fads do not live long and cannot be predicted, advertising and propaganda help to spread them. Pictures

of styles of fads in clothes, for example, help to make fads reach a large number of people. And if with the help of publicity fads are widely accepted for long they become fashions, as for example bobbed hair, slacks, no headgear for men.

Crazes

Crazes are generated as quickly as the fad but they collapse very suddenly. The area of behaviour that is involved in a craze is very much limited but the people are very strongly affected, more emotionally involved and spend disproportionately larger time in their crazy activity. Such activities are feverish and time-consuming, and they spread like wildfire. 'Rock and roll' was a craze sometime back as was chain-letters. R. W. Brown calls it a 'mass folly', it is a mental epidemic.

A craze is more trivial than a fad, and has serious personal, and social consequences.

Chain-letter crazes have prospered in America. You receive a letter in which you are asked to write the same letter to five of your friends. You have to send 10 cents to the person who sends you the letter, omit his name and put in your own. In course of time you will receive 10 cents from others. The list will increase and you are promised a large sum. In India some religious minded persons started such chains and promised religious salvation to people. Thousands of people fell for the appeal.

The story of the Elvis Presley craze is well known. He was all the rage in America during 1956-57. A guitar-playing 'rock-and-roll' singer this 21-year-old young man became an international figure. Wherever he went teenagers went crazy and shouted for him. They doted on all he was, had and said. Parents, clergymen and leaders were alarmed at the great influence and magic he exercised over young people sending them into hysteria of screeching and wailing. Businessmen were not slow to exploit his popularity and sold millions worth articles in his name.

Several studies have been made of crazes. A dynamic society is more craze-ridden than one in which customs and traditions rule supreme. When changes in society are rapid and frequent, when the wisdom of ancestors is discounted and when norms and values are in a fluid state crazes are common and strong.

Again when society is homogeneous and without class and caste distinctions crazes have a free run. When a craze is very wide in its sweep even highly intelligent people fall a prey to it, and the greater it spreads the more absurd things it makes people believe. But the craze liquidates itself soon enough. It spreads like wildfire and all those who fall for it gain prominence. But as soon as it gets general it loses its charm and is dropped by everyone.

Booms

While fads and crazes are trivial, booms are vital and involve some aspects of economic behaviour. Booms are most often of the 'get rich quick' sort and occur during periods of prosperity when speculation and optimism are rampant. Land and shares have been boomed from time to time and place to place. In the twenties people began to think that Florida would boom and it would be easy to make money by investing in land there. So the boom spread and people flocked to Florida in millions. Land prices were already high and now went higher, people made money easily and quickly. The boom was at its peak in 1925 and in 1926 there was a crash. And when the crash came most people could not believe that they themselves had acted so unwisely. In India, too, there have been booms on a smaller scale. In fact booms are a common and recurrent phenomenon in capitalistic society in which there is large scope for speculation, acquisition and adventure.

Fads, crazes and booms are irrational mass behaviour. They abound in a free competitive society in which frustration and hopes alternate. It is difficult to distinguish between these three because they have much in common. All of them appear suddenly, are highly irrational and full of emotion, disappear soon enough, cannot be predicted and have been commercialized from time to time. Modern society has highly developed means of communication which help to spread fads, crazes and booms. Booms have more serious consequences because they generally involve financial schemes of 'get rich quick' or 'gold mine' type.

Conclusion

We have been studying mass behaviour in its several forms.

Fads, fashions, crazes and booms are transient forms of mass behaviour. Fads become fashions when they are more stable and enduring, that is, when a large number of people adopt them and continue to do so for some period of time. Fashions are changes which occur from time to time in social behaviour. Some of them are widely accepted and endure. They become customs. As has already been stressed fashions are variations occurring within the framework of customs. They occur in cycles and people who follow the dictates of fashion do so for considerations of prestige and conformity. Fads may become fashions and later on customs, only if they endure.

Social movements

When people are dissatisfied with social institutions because they no longer fulfil their needs they wish to change these institutions. The efforts to make these changes may be described as social movements. Such efforts are collective, they are planned and they are based on frustration and unrest on the part of the people. In our own times we have known several social movements, for example, movement to abolish caste distinctions, movement for removing untouchability, disabilities of women, defects in the marriage system, hardships of shop assistants, movement to rehabilitate refugees.

By far the most powerful social movement which has spread all over the world encompassing all countries is directed at securing social justice and bridging the gulf between haves and have-nots. In every region and state intellectual leaders have worked hard to rouse the conscience of the masses to the hard lot of labourers. At first they focussed public atention on social injustice and the miserable conditions under which labourers worked and lived The Industrial Revolution hastened the need and importance of such a movement. The Russian Revolution after the First Great War and the establishment of communist regime in that country was a violent form of the same social movement. Socialism and communism are directed at the same objective, and the various socialistic parties have programmes and policies for uplifting the position of the labour classes. Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Nehru led a great mass movement for revolutionary changes in India before Independence and after Independence Pandit Nehru had acted as a leader of a powerful

social movement for reform and enrichment of society in India.

Some social movements are aggressive and violent as the communist movement. They destroy institutions by force, indulge in subversive activities and kill people. They want to demolish and destroy and then build afresh. Such movements are revolutionary, they challenge the very basis of the social structure and seek to usher in a new order after destroying the existing one. On the other hand we have reform movements which accept the basis and value of the present social order but try to bring about changes in it in order to secure social justice. Gandhi led a non-violent revolutionary movement, a unique thing in social history.

Social movements are born out of social frustration and unrest. Masses are roused, emotions run strong and people are excited. The movement becomes popular and gains strength. Programmes and policies are discussed and defined, demands will be formulated and institutions will be set up to fight for rights and to secure the acceptance of demands. The powers that be may suppress them or fail to do so. In the latter case they come forward with compromise proposals or may partially accept demands made by the social movement. There may be a long-drawn conflict which may degenerate into violence. Leaders may call off the struggle or let it grow more violent. This is the general pattern which the National Congress of India followed in their mass movement for the freedom and independence of the country, and one of the greatest achievements of Mahatma Gandhi was that he did not allow this mass movement to get violent and out of hand. The apostle of non-violence was scrupulous in playing fair even with a foreign power and keeping national struggle on a highly moral plane.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

YOUNG, K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.).

LINDZEY, G. *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Vol. I (Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.).

SARGENT, S. S. and WILLIAMSON, R. C. *Social Psychology* (New York: The Ronald Press Company).

LAPIERE and FARNSWORTH. *Social Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company)
ALLPORT, G. W. and POSTMAN, L. I. *The Psychology of Rumour* (New York: Henry Holt & Co)
GINSBERG, M. *The Psychology of Society* (London: Methuen & Co.)
CANTRIL, H. *The Psychology of Social Movements* (New York: John Wiley and Sons).

CHAPTER XVIII

SOCIAL CHANGE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

THE PROBLEM of social change and social progress strictly belongs to sociology but since social psychology studies the individual in relation to society and since social changes and social progress affect human relationships and the mental life of the individual it may be considered here in brief.

Primitive man accepted the social world as it was. He feared and hated social change. In fact in most countries he felt that man's golden age was in the past and considered his own times as faded and degenerate echoes of ancient glory and happiness. Most people distrust change. Even today in the year of grace 1970 when India is straining all her resources to make rapid advances in technology, industry, transport, communication, education and arts to come up to the standard of the most progresssive countries of the West some people never tire of singing the glories of the past. For them routine, stability, absence of change is a value in itself.

But change is inevitable. Societies never stay the same.

Causes of social change

What are the causes of social change? Societies change their members; their thoughts, beliefs, values, customs and achievements change. Such social changes are caused by several factors.

Physical factors in natural events like floods, earthquakes, famines, shortage of food and fodder due to draughts drive people out of their homes to other regions where work is available and life is easier. In our own times atomic explosions have made several regions radioactive and obliged people to migrate.

Biological factors are no less important though they are not adequately recognized. Difference in intelligence and temperament, mixture of racial stocks or population control by family planning and the like bear upon the pattern of future social

structure. Each generation is a new beginning and may bring about social changes however small.

Technological factors of social change are in ample evidence if we consider the radical changes brought about by the Industrial Revolution. The steam-engine, the aeroplane, the telephone, the radio, refrigerators and the mass production of consumers' goods have added to human comfort and luxury, but they have also increased the number and complexity of our wants, led to new divisions of labour and created a new civilization Time and labour saving devices have increased unemployment and given man so much leisure that the does not know how to spend it.

Cultural influences on social change are observed when different racial groups come into contact In our own times we have seen the influence of the British on Indian society. With improved means of communication and transport we have come in contact with the people of the entire world, our ideas have felt their impact and we have been led to revise and change our ways of thought and life, our values and ideals Different social, political, moral, and economic creeds come into conflict and new ones are brought into being changing ways of social living and thinking. Reading travel books, visiting foreign lands and meeting people from other countries, we dislike some of their ways but we are impressed by others and wish to follow them How much we have to learn from the British, the Japanese and the Americans is frequently brought home to us when we study their ways of working and living, eating and dressing, thinking and feeling. The hybrid culture of New Delhi, Bombay and Calcutta is the result of such cultural influences.

The impact of *visionary leaders* on social change is very important. Swami Dayanand, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru dreamed of a better and higher social structure for their countrymen and worked hard to bring it about. Their influence on Indian society has been healthy and abiding Swami Dayanand tried to liberate Hindus from superstition and ignorance and awakened in them a just pride in their cultural heritage which they had forgotten. Raja Ram Mohan Roy sought to abolish some of the harmful ways, customs and institutions among Hindus. Mahatma Gandhi worked for the removal of untouchability, religious tolerance and intercom-

munal harmony. Nehru made Indians look towards the future for their glory and happiness instead of the past and gave us the vision of planned development.

Effects of social changes on the individual

When radical social changes take place due to wars, revolutions or class conflicts individuals have to change their settled way of life, their homes, occupations or social setting. They are mentally upset and do not wish to make the changes. At the time of Partition in India Punjabis from what is now known as West Pakistan were compelled to migrate to eastern districts and states. They were sore about it and intercommunal conflict resulted in large-scale killing, looting and burning. In the colonies and towns in which they settled they tried to preserve their old ways of thinking and living, their traditions and customs, their language and dress, but their children had to live like the children of the town or state in which they now found their homes. New language, dress, diet, manners, etc. were acquired by the next generation and were brought into the family. Often they were looked down upon and felt inferior and handicapped. But they had to submit to these changes and often there was an intense conflict in their minds and a social conflict too.

In some a spirit of adventure and enterprise was aroused and they made good, in others suffering, poverty, and losses produced strong feelings of inferiority and an attitude of defeatism. There was great feeling of insecurity and uncertainty. Those who migrated in groups tried to retain their old community life but those whom needs of occupation drove into a new place alone tried to make compromises with the community in which they were placed. The refugees from West Pakistan succeeded in adapting themselves to new conditions and society but those from East Pakistan found it very difficult. The former were able to make compromises which the latter failed to make. It greatly affected their emotional life and they had to face difficult problems of adjustment.

Quite a number of them were not educated and did not understand why all this had happened. Even those who understood its political background could not understand the justice of it. They lost faith in God and His laws. Some of them had no moral scruples in dealing with others and resorted to all sorts of

methods and means to get along in life. Their moral fibre was weakened. But in others religious consciousness became stronger, they had greater fellow-feeling and helped each other.

Before migration there were higher and lower classes and castes but in the new situation interclass and intercaste prejudices disappeared. Marriage barriers were relaxed and sex-ethics weakened. Some abducted women were discarded on recovery and some were kindly welcomed

Similar effects of wars, famines, floods and earthquakes on individual life and mind have been noticed. Recently there has been large migration of rural population to town or industrial townships in search of work. These people leave well-defined communities and merge into a mass society of towns where nobody looks into their past, minds their caste or worries about what they do, how they live or what sort of persons they are. Community life disappears but they have no social restrictions and taboos. They live in small tenements and develop maladjustments and emotional disturbances due to lack of intimate social associations and experiences. They resort to drinking, cinema-going, gambling and the like.

During wars husbands and fathers are called up and wives and mothers have to find jobs, and look after the families. There is disturbance and tension, individuals have to face problems and they struggle to readjust.

Interpretation of social change

Change is the law of life, and changes in society are always taking place. There are times when these changes are slow, in fact so slow that people do not even perceive them, as there are times when they are so rapid and drastic. Man is so constituted that he is very slow to change his behaviour patterns, ideas, attitudes and values, yet in periods of stress when great disasters and crises overtake him, as it happened at the time of the Partition, ideas and values, attitudes and habits receive a violent shake-up and change suddenly and radically. It is the work of the social scientists to interpret this phenomenon of social change, and this has been done in several ways and from several angles by anthropologists, sociologists and social psychologists. We shall now discuss these interpretations.

Anthropology and social change

Anthropologists look upon all social change as cultural change but they restrict cultural changes to changes in technology, food, clothing, arts, modes of transport and communication, of relaxation and work, values, customs and social relationships. Their concern is to describe the nature of such changes and how they are brought about. According to them the processes involved in social change are innovation, diffusion, assimilation and acculturation.

In a way all social change is an *innovation* in so far as it brings in new ideas and new patterns of behaviour. New discoveries and inventions have always made a difference in social forms and functions. In olden times people travelled by foot, horseback or bullock-cart. The invention of the steam-engine, the bicycle, the automobile or the aeroplane has revolutionized our habits and modes of travelling. Society is very much different for these inventions. The social scientist is mostly concerned with large social changes brought about by important inventions but there are minor new ideas too which have affected changes. The growth of psychology has changed our ideas and approach to child-upbringing, and parents today are more tender and considerate to their children than they were a century ago. The popularity of tea and coffee, the introduction of aerated waters, the coming up of eating stalls and the like have changed our food habits and social ways. It is easy to multiply instances of social changes brought about by new ideas and tools.

The processes of innovation are continuously going on wherever men and women are seriously trying to interpret life in fiction or drama, in arts and crafts, in workshops and laboratories and in the quiet studies of creative thinkers. Wherever there is an original mind, innovation cannot help occurring. But innovation and creation does not depend merely on individual initiative and effort. Nations and communities have set up institutions for encouraging, financing and organizing research and banks and industrial houses are for ever searching for new ideas and new things. In India we have set up National Laboratories and Research Institutes and talents and material resources are being mobilized to discover new ideas and tools. Modern research has led to the atomic age and today all nations great and small are investing in research for national survival and security. But the

phenomenal advance in physical sciences has created social problems which baffle solution, and the social sciences are keen to study social situations and suggest new remedies for our social ills.

But in any one culture the number of discoveries and inventions made may be relatively small, and this is made up by borrowing new ideas and tools from other cultures. This is *diffusion.* Diffusion as a more or less natural process by which multitudes of individuals discriminate, select and accept new traits freely and without outside pressure, is one thing, but diffusion as it goes on under the barrage of mass publicity and propaganda through newspapers, radio, salesmanship, advertising and organized national drives for the emancipation of depressed classes, for family planning, or eradication of malaria is something else. New products bring in new ideas but they come in whether we like them or not. Those who wish to sell do not let us make a choice on the basis of merit or after examining evidence, but they seem to pursue us with full-page advertisements, calendars, diaries and what not. The new ink not only writes (what-else will it do if it does not write?) but it also does not block the pen, washes it clean while it flows, is indelible, pleasant to smell and cheap to buy. Who can escape such methods of distribution? But diffusion is the process by which material things, traits, ideas, moods, and the like are spread. Suppose you are buying a packet of cigarettes for the first time. It is distribution for the dealer but it is diffusion for you as you are taking up the cigarette habit. Such diffusion may take place from one generation to another as the habit of hooka-smoking used to spread from the father to the son. Much of the education taking place outside the school is just diffusion, that is, the transfer of the behaviour patterns of the old to the young

Diffusion may take place from one social class to another, and even from one sex to another. In India upper classes acquired a good deal of the traits and ideas of the British, their speech, dress, manners, and the like were borrowed from the British in their struggle for status. And women are taking to masculine ways of smoking, putting on slacks or leading carefree life of sexual laxity. Many men in upper and middle strata spend too much time and care on personal appearance as ladies do These are examples of sexual diffusion

Diffusion may take place through carriage as Sir Walter Raleigh carried tobacco to England and thereby diffused tobacco as a culture trait. Or diffusion may take place through transfer as new slang words, new popular songs or new popular moods pass from one to another. But carriage and transfer often go hand in hand.

Assimilation is a process by which two or more cultural heritages represented by single individuals or groups of individuals, become blended or fused into a single cultural heritage so that the persons share the same sentiments, customs, memories, traditions and loyalties. This means that assimilation is a process whereby individuals or groups once dissimilar become similar, that is, they become identified in their interests and outlook. American culture represents assimilation in a marked degree. The modern Indian culture also represents fusion and assimilation of Hindu, Muslim and British cultures. Often assimilation is regarded as one-way process. According to this view when an Indian lands in England and comes in contact with Western culture he imbibes many Western ways of eating, dressing, speaking and thinking. He abandons his own culture and takes on the new. We say he has assimilated the Western culture. Rather he has accepted a foreign culture but contributed nothing to it. Such a process does not involve social interaction. Assimilation is a social process involving interpenetration of different cultures. National pride often nullifies one-sided assimilation. True assimilation means that both learn from each other and get amalgamated through intermarriage and participation in common social and economic life.

Finally, social change takes place through a process of *acculturation*. Societies of different cultures are modified through fairly close and prolonged contact, but this modification does not mean complete blending of the two cultures. The two communities, British and Indian, through long continued association in this country transferred their cultural norms to each other so that they identified themselves with those norms and regarded them as their own norms. Hindus and Muslims in India also present an example of acculturation. Long association in history has made them learn a lot from each other and yet kept them distinct.

Cultures and communities vary in the extent to which they

will accept social change. Indians have assimilated more from the British than the latter have assimilated from the former. For a long time Hindus resisted Muslim and British cultures and even now there are sub-groups which resist the pressure of other cultures. But anthropology is interested in social change and not in resistance to it. Material traits are more likely to change than the belief systems. The problems of integration are being faced by almost every nation and efforts are being made at the state level to solve them by large-scale legislations.

Sociology and social change

Sociology studies the pattern of social dynamics over a period of time. Is there a universal tendency toward social change? What is the nature of such a tendency? How are institutions and their inter-relations related to social change? Is there a regular cycle in social change? Why is social change more rapid in some years than in others? Answers to these questions are sought by sociologists. It is obvious that they deal with many aspects of social change.

Some sociologists are interested in a general theoretical explanation of social change, that is, in interpreting the relation of events to social systems One view is that every social system tends to regain its equilibrium in spite of serious disturbances, conflicts and strains. A second view is that social systems rise and fall by a process of evolution or by cycles. And the third is a compromise approach combining both the previous views. Some social conflicts and disturbances lead to revolutions when some parts or aspects of the social system are out of joint with the larger social order.

Sociology also studies social causation bringing out the influence of social movements and events on social change Since tools and material equipment have been the principal determinants of culture in any society the progress of technology has been *the greatest single factor* in social change. If we compare social conditions today with those obtaining hundred years back the changes will mostly be attributed to rapid advances in technology. Rapid means of transport and communication, electric power, sewing machines, cycles, tubewells, and the like have effected radical changes in the Indian social scene. Tractors and bulldozers have reclaimed land which was considered unculti v-

able, fertilizers have increased production, cycles have emancipated women. The cinema and the radio have raised the standard of recreation and appreciation but made people avoid social intercourse, evening games and clubs. The radio has provided greater enjoyment of music, wider knowledge of the world, increased adult education, offered weather reports to farmers and ships, provided jobs for musicians and announcers, changed political campaigns and provided incentives to industrialists to manufacture radio sets.

Similarly, effects of automobiles and aeroplanes on business and industry, on family life and crime, on recreation and traffic have been far-reaching.

Cultural lag

Social scientists have coined the term 'cultural lag' to indicate the strain between material and technological progress on the one hand and the slow social and moral advancement if any. It stands for disparity and unequal growth in two parts of our culture, material and non-material. We usually adopt very readily new ways of building houses, new styles of furnishing them, new gadgets to improve our ways of living and working and even new devices and machines to increase production, but we are rather slow to adopt new practices in law courts, new methods and ideas in education. This gap in two aspects of our culture is the 'cultural lag'. Laws, customs, religious practices, and the like resist change, at times rather successfully, but industrial organization, management and labour are changing rapidly. When the two move at different speeds there is bound to be a lag between the two.

Examples of 'cultural lag' are many. Indians dress themselves in ultra-Western styles but behave and think like people of the Middle Ages. Too many Hindus are very modern in their ways of living; dress, food, furniture, cars, drinking, clubbing are all in the latest fashion, but their religious and social ways at the time of marriage and death are the same old ones that prevailed centuries back. Another case of cultural lag may be cited from administration. Our legislative machinery is the most progressive but our administrative wings, our police methods and our approach toward criminals is still outmoded and backward. Again towns draw large populations from villages and increase

in size but the police and administrative provision may continue to be the same as it was for a smaller population. In fact urbanization has become a cultural lag. Cities were at one time a sign and a centre of progress. It is doubtful if we can say the same thing about large Indian towns today. Problems of urban living have become worse. Insufficient water supply, polluted air and water, long distances and poor transport facilities, lack of milk supply, and the like have made living in cities difficult and dangerous. We may add to them the threat from nuclear attacks, and our planners have already begun to think of dispersing urban populations into small towns or building houses underground.

Cultural lag which we see today between material culture, on the one hand, and institutional culture, on the other, is only a special case of disharmonious change. In many countries and in other times of history this lag has been quite the other way, the material culture lagging behind the institutional. This was the case during the Hindu and Mughal periods of history. Because this cultural lag is the result of differential rates of change in different parts of the same culture, regardless of what particular parts, and of the failure of readjustment to keep pace with the changes, many people have begun to suggest that a moratorium on mechanical invention and technology be declared until the lags of society have caught up. Others suggest that changes in one part or aspect of culture have already taken place and so quick adjustments must be made in the second aspect to new conditions. If changes in one part of our culture could be foreseen and prevented, maladjustments and the lag could be avoided. But both suggestions presuppose a high degree of social control and planning which it has not been possible to achieve in history.

Psychology and social change

Psychology is mostly concerned with people's attitude toward social change and tries to study psychological processes involved in individual adjustment and resistance to social change. Our cultural patterns influence our attitudes, and changes in society and culture modify our attitudes and values. But changes in social relations, norms and customs are not possible unless there is a corresponding change in people's attitudes. Therefore the problem for the social psychologist is to study resistance and to

change factors which weaken such resistance.

Societies ridden by hide-bound customs and traditions are averse to change. They are static and people in those societies do not expect any changes and have no attitude to change. But modern groups are undergoing rapid changes, as a result of the phenomenal advances in technology, stronger international contacts and radical social changes. Since winning Independence India too has experienced vast and radical changes in almost every aspect and area of national life, and people's attitudes toward these changes vary from whole-hearted welcome to whole-hearted resistance with a large majority placed somewhere between the two extremes of radicalism and conservatism. A study of the proceedings of the Parliament on any day reveals some people criticizing the government for not going fast enough and far enough in the matter of reforms and others abusing the government for having demolished the old traditional ways and values.

Social scientists speak of four types of general attitudes toward social change and then seek to relate specific personality traits to them. Such attitudes are described as reactionary, conservative, liberal and radical. Reactionary people are those who glorify the past, would like us to revive the ancient customs, traditions and values and resist all change. Conservative people believe that things as they are should continue, they stand for the *status quo*. Liberals are progressives and favour gradual step by step social change. They speak of the evolution of society. Radicals are thoroughly dissatisfied with the present and would like to bring about radical changes rapidly, even violently. Whenever any issue is investigated, attempts are made to classify opinions into such a scheme. In the first place these names are not used merely to describe attitudes or points of view. They imply moral judgement, for the term 'reactionary' conveys some condemnation of the attitude just as the term 'liberal' implies some element of commendation. Second, it is difficult to establish that such generalized attitudes as 'radicalism' or 'liberalism' really exist and that individuals are always characterized by such attitudes. In case of progressive countries like America, Great Britain or Russia it is difficult to say if there are many individuals who sing praises of the good old times and wish to revive them. On the contrary one would think that people have reconciled themselves to social changes and would rather wish that such

changes were more radical and many-sided. It is in countries like India that reactionary and revivalist tendencies and attitudes are found. But here too such attitudes are not general. Even those who want to bring back the days of Rama and Krishna have no hesitation in using electric gadgets and aeroplanes. In fact such attitudes are inconsistent and less general.

But several studies made by social psychologists of people's attitudes toward social change reveal considerable generality or internal consistency in attitudes of radicalism and conservatism. We have already referred to the fact that general conservatism implies and goes with religious preference and church membership. It has been found that such general attitudes are found in several areas of life like politics, economics, religion, customs, laws and international relations. Some investigators find great inconsistency in radical and conservative attitudes and therefore argue that there are no such generalized attitudes.

Finally, it must not be overlooked that it is very difficult to offer a very exact definition of such terms as reactionary, conservative or liberal, and much more to give them a meaning in terms of attitude toward social change. In fact they cannot be understood apart from the goals and values of the individual.

Social psychology also seeks to study important influences bearing on attitudes to social change. The influence of the home and the family has been found to be very important in determining young people's attitude to social change. Studies made in America reveal that children's attitude to war and religion correlate highly with those of their parents, and how consistent parental attitudes are is reflected in children. The influence of the school is not so important, partly because children spend less time with their teachers than they do with their parents and partly because their attitudes are more or less formed before they enter school. Educationists all over the world are conscious of the need for preparing young people for the rapidly changing world in which their lives will be spent. Too often teachers are educating children for a world or age which is passing [illegible] and when their pupils grow up they will find themselves [illegible] to meet the needs of the changing world. Stress, [illegible] laid on teaching and learning flexible habits of thinking [illegible] having so that they can effectively meet the challenge [illegible] pidly changing society in which they will live as [illegible]

Some personality traits also determine people's attitude to social change. Intelligent people with knowledge and understanding are sensitive to the needs and difficulties of others and tend to be liberal toward social change. On the other hand rigidity of mind and intellect inclines people to be conservative and even reactionary. Generally the factor of age is also important. Youth is inclined to welcome social change while old people do not like it.

Many people favour social change because they have been frustrated in the *status quo* or as a protest against present authority of parents and administrators. The agitator, the radical and the reformist people are those who have a grievance against the present regime and seek social change to gain freedom from it. But it is difficult to specify the role of such unconscious factors in influencing attitudes toward social change.

Social disorganization

A well organized society is one in which the different parts are in a harmonious adjustment and are equally affected by change. When this adjustment is altered and there is lack of co-ordination between different parts there results social disorganization. If by a process of automatization in factories a large number of workmen are thrown out of employment, if there is a phenomenal rise in crime in the country, if as a result of the Gold Control Act a large number of goldsmiths are rendered idle, there is social disorganization. We have already dealt with the cultural lag due to rapid advances in technology, and if inventions follow each other too rapidly leading to radical social changes there is great imbalance in society. Disease, famine, wars, earthquakes, large-scale migration of populations like the one that took place in 1947 in India, and floods, are some of the common causes of social disorganization. Again, too many public houses of disrepute, gambling dens and crime gangs also disorganize social life. Disorganization is a condition wherein the structure breaks down, and many of our social problems may be traced to the unequal advance of different parts of our society.

Social progress

Obviously social change must have a direction and a purpose so that it leads to greater social adjustment. The basic factors

in social change are heredity, culture, geographical environment and group. These factors are always changing, though in some *changes are slow and in others they* are quick. Changes in natural environment and in hereditary evolution are slow while changes in culture and group living are quite rapid. Now the question is whether these factors changing at unequal rates lead to good adjustments or maladjustments. Harmonious adjustment among the changing factors of nature, man, culture and group provides a desirable goal for social striving and a suitable criterion for social progress We have already mentioned factors and influences which disturb social organization and whose elimination or reduction would make for better social adjustments. Reduction and final elimination of disease, famine, poverty, ignorance, crime, slums, depressions, and the like should certainly lead to progress but this is at best a negative approach. Our main concern is to determine the essentials of social progress and to examine some of the views about its nature. Let us examine the *latter part first.*

Social scientists are not agreed about the nature of social progress. There is, first, the *anthropological* view that the most important determinant of social progress is favourable natural climate, good fertile soil, ready availability of natural resources like water, wood, vegetation and the like. Most of the early civilizations prospered in places like northern India, Egypt, Greece and Rome, because geographical conditions were favourable there. But such a theory is very inadequate since it fails to explain the decay or fall of such civilizations as the geographical conditions did not change.

Others seek to account for social progress on the basis of *racial heredity*. Some races are biologically superior and make progress. The empire builders of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries prided themselves that their dominance over subject *nations was due to the* fact that they were of a higher and better stock. All that was great, creative and fruitful in science, art and civilization sprang from one and the same root—the Teutonic race, the Nordic race or the Aryans. But it is difficult to give an exact *definition of race except by reference to colour of* the skin, texture of hair, shape of the head and stature of the body. Nor is any race pure. And there seems to be some truth in the argument that racial characteristics are in the long run a

result of geographical environment.

Karl Marx argued that the basic factor in social progress is *economic*. Ultimately all social progress is determined by the mode of production and distribution of goods, the division and consumption of wealth, the relationship of employer to employee, the class-war between the rich and the poor. Legal and political structures, religion, morality, art, science, literature, and philosophy hinge on economic conditions. The rise and fall of empires, crime, immorality, luxury or refinement are the results of economic causes. All wars are fought for either natural resources or trade opportunities of some countries. Political power sooner or later follows economic power. The form of government depends upon the distribution of land; if most of it is owned by one man, we have monarchy; if it is owned by a few, we have aristocracy; if it is owned by the people, we have democracy. America was discovered not for the sake of Christianity but for gold.

Man's political, social and spiritual life, his ideals and values, his morality and religion are largely influenced by industry, technology and distribution system and his social progress largely consists of securing the material means of subsistence. If economic conditions are satisfactory all other conditions will follow automatically. Ideals are fig-leaves concealing material needs and economic factors lurk behind every great event.

There is no doubt that economic factors are very important and higher forms of civilization cannot be achieved without removing economic inequality and injustice and without securing minimum economic needs of the people, but man does not live by bread alone nor does his happiness and fulfilment lie merely in surrounding himself with material luxuries. He has a mind and a conscience, and mental and moral considerations and adjustments are equally important. Any explanation of social progress which leaves mind and morals out of account cannot be considered adequate. Human intelligence and creative genius has often given new directions to social life by emphasizing new values and standards and establishing new institutions modifying personal and social relations. After all adjustments are not merely adjustments to things around us but to individuals and social situations, and many changes and improvements in personal and social relations have been effected by master minds independently and well in advance of the material and economic

changes and improvements.

The *psychological* theory of social progress holds that the key to social progress must be found in human intellect, in man's creative and constructive genius in knowing and understanding his own nature, in his growing insight into personal and social relations and interactions These have enabled him to gain mastery over himself and his natural environment, and as this mastery increased, his values and ideals underwent change, social attitudes and sentiments developed, and social life progressed Social progress depends mainly on personal and social adjustments and these are determined by psychological factors mentioned here. Ideas, thoughts, feelings, attitudes, sentiments, and the like are the tool of adjustment, and their right education and development leads to social progress. Education as an agency for modifying human behaviour, for spreading and imparting knowledge and for cultivating socially desirable habits and sentiments is an important means of promoting social progress. Modern trends in education emphasize the growth and development of the whole man or the total personality so that men and women imbued with knowledge and understanding, sympathy and goodwill, and a spirit of social service and larger good of humanity may strive to raise the level of social behaviour and promote social progress. Education is a social enterprise striving for social goals and social progress.

There are other institutions working for social progress. Scientific knowledge of the evils of smoking and drinking is being spread by temperance societies, life insurance corporation is spreading knowledge about the causes and symptoms of common diseases so that people may detect them in time and take preventive measures, health departments, family planning programmes, road safety education, and the like are doing important work for social progress to secure health, longevity, efficiency and happiness for the people. In fact the several areas of public life and service are engaged in the common task of building a better and happier society by influencing the attitudes and outlook of people.

Social psychology, interested as it is in the behaviour of the individual in a social setting, must take into account all the important factors of the social environment and the mental and moral make-up of the individual which bear on his behaviour

Therefore it has to take a composite view of social progress attaching due weight to geographical, biological, economic and psychological factors. We have already stressed the need of a harmonious adjustment between man, nature, culture and group so that the progress of humanity may involve the totality of individual and social living. Progressive social development means the ever-widening horizons of social consciousness, growing knowledge of man, nature and society and healthy attitudes and sentiments toward social good.

The criterion of social progress

How should social progress be assessed? What are its goals and contents and in what does social progress consist? The answers are varied and numerous. Some measure social progress by material advancement and the amount of comfort enjoyed by people. In our own times socially advanced societies are those whose standard of living is high with a plethora of consumers' goods, which can boast of a highly industrialized economy and where labour saving devices and gadgets are in plentiful use. Others measure social progress by the number of highly organized institutions leading to great division of labour and interdependence of individuals. Still others measure social progress by the low rate of divorces, peace and harmony in social relations, respect and affection in domestic life and the like. But all these are just rough estimates. The economics of America, England and Germany may be superior but can we on that account regard them as socially advanced nations? Hindu society ridden by castes and sub-castes, rites and ceremonies, at one time in history must have had highly organized social life but was it on that account highly progressive? In several primitive communities family life was ruled by sentiments of love and respect but they could not be called progressive.

In a highly advanced society people must have good health free from disease and physical handicaps, with a higher average longevity, they must have material prosperity, plenty of good food and consumers' goods, literacy figures and educational standards must be high, and they must be inspired by higher spiritual and moral ideals and values. Growing advancement in medical science, technology, political freedom and stability, refinement of culture, freedom from reservations in accepting change in social

and political structure, all these must be present in a socially advanced society. Perhaps the ideal suggested previously of growing harmonious adjustment among the four factors of social change, *viz. man, nature, culture and group* though a little abstract embodies the criterion of social progress admirably. Illness is unsatisfactory adjustment between man and nature as mental disorders are maladjustments between man's inherited nature and group culture. Economic depressions, famines, civil strifes, strikes, and the like are also maladjustments In modern times all progressive nations are earnestly engaged in achieving satisfactory adjustments through reform movements, legislation and programmes of social reconstruction, and are initiating social changes which may lead to social progress We may close this chapter with a brief note on social planning.

Social planning

All progressive states have programmes of social reconstruction and are trying to control social changes. Gandhiji popularized the notion of *Ramrajya* and the term 'welfare state' is well known in all democratic and progressive countries Russia has had *several five-year plans and India too has a planning commission* and five-year plans with targets and priorities, and the movement for planning is gaining momentum It has made nations look ahead in a changing society and control their destiny Social planning is different from social reform As W M Ogburn and M. F. Nimkoff observe, 'While reform is remedial and corrective, planning is preventive and constructive A plan is laid out as an *achievement to be made in a certain length* of time The emphasis is on the practical rather than on aspirations of the fantasy type Various specialized planning bodies have been quite successful in looking into the more immediate future and in planning for such practical considerations as educational facilities, electric power, and flood control.'*

Plans are almost always for a short period so that progress may be reviewed. Planning *for population control has to be on a long-term* basis But plans for industrial development, housing, education or health insurance may be drawn for three or five years. Planning requires a high degree of social discipline

* *A Handbook of Sociology* (London. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd) p 617.

and possibly loss of liberty, and successful implementation of the plans needs concentration of authority. Plans may be formulated for several areas of social life and if success follows more comprehensive plans may be drawn up and social progress may be more integrated.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

CARR, L. J. *Analytical Sociology* (New York: Harper & Brothers).

OGBURN, W. F. and NIMKOFF, M. F. *A Handbook of Sociology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.).

SARGENT, S. S. and WILLIAMSON, R. C. *Social Psychology* (New York: The Ronald Press Company).

LINTON, R. *The Study of Man* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co.).

ALLEN, F. L. *The Big Change* (New York: Harper & Brothers).

ALLEN, F. R. *Technology and Social Change* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co.).

CHAPTER XIX

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF REVOLUTION AND WAR

SOCIAL CHANGES may take place through a process of evolution or of revolution The evolutionary process of *socio-cultural* change is slow, gradual, and orderly. Revolution, on the other hand, is a rapid and sudden change of some magnitude in culture. The invention of the steam-engine was a revolution in transportation and so was the invention of motor car. But the type of change most frequently called revolution occurs in the political organization of a society. Such changes are usually *marked by the use of violence and social disorganization though* often sudden and widespread changes called revolution may lead to an adjustment to political upheaval without any significant social change. We are here concerned with political revolution involving shift of political power in state, and though we have described it as sudden and rapid it has its roots in some necessary conditions preceding it.

Revolution and war are the most violent and engrossing human conflicts and struggles for power, and with modern means *and weapons of mass destruction these forms of group conflict* threaten the very existence and survival of humanity, society and culture.

The meaning of revolution

Revolution may be defined as an abrupt, drastic and forced shift in the power and authority structure within a nation-state. The old party *in power or the old system of authority is replaced* by a new party or system, and often the change is made without any use of force or violence. Not a shot was fired when Nasser came into power in Egypt or Iskander Mirza, and later Ayub, seized power in Pakistan, but the Bolshevik party virtually waded through blood to gain authority in Russia and so did the party of Franco in Spain. Revolutions set up a new

form of government, enforcing new laws and a new form of political control backed by military force. But all revolutions are not successful. When they fail it is mostly because the basic social attitudes, beliefs and ideas have not changed and the conservative forces are able to retain or regain their authority.

But all revolutions are not violent. In India many great names like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Swami Vivekananda, Swami Dayanand, Mahatma Gandhi and Vinoba Bhave have brought about great social revolutions by establishing new social institutions and bringing about radical changes in the attitudes and ideas of people. Raja Ram Mohan Roy was responsible for abolishing the great social evil of *sati* with the help of the British government. Swami Vivekananda and Dayanand through speeches and writings awakened the masses to a new consciousness of their great and glorious heritage and changed their ideas about the religious scriptures, the Vedas and the Upanishads stimulating them to pursue their study and follow the way of life indicated by them. Mahatma Gandhi's contribution to Indian nationalism is very remarkable. He inspired the masses to assert themselves politically and culturally, to aim at higher moral and social values, to regain human dignity and freedom, to throw away the yoke of obsolete customs and folkways as communal hatred, untouchability, caste prejudice, and to love Swadeshi and Khadi. Through his prayer meetings and writings he changed people's attitudes toward child marriage, education of women, drinking, temple entry of Harijans and the like. Vinoba Bhave's great mass movement of Bhoodan, voluntary surrender of land to be given away to the landless, and Sardar Patel's work in the dissolution of several hundred princely states in the interest of national integration and unity were equally revolutionary changes which have no parallel in history.

The silent social revolution effected by the Congress Government in India after assuming power in 1947 is no less radical and spectacular. The abolition of the Zamindari system, the setting up of panchayats, the expansion of education and numerous other laws have effected far-reaching social changes in the country. These revolutionary changes have been brought about without the use of force. The transfer of political power which took place in 1947 and the subsequent changes were inspired and led by a party which believed in peaceful and non-

violent means and the Congress is pledged to bring about a socialistic secular society through democratic institutions. In fact the success of our non-violent revolution before and after Independence has inspired the programmes of many revolutionary parties in Africa and other parts of the world.

So we may widen the definition of revolution to include radical and drastic changes brought about by non-violent and peaceful means as well.

Factors in a revolution

Social scientists have tried to explain revolutions in many ways and we may discuss them here.

One view is that a revolution is an outburst of repressed instincts and emotions. It is a sort of mob behaviour in which the unconscious, lower and long repressed drives break the bonds of convention and overthrow authority. Freudian thinkers trace it to several unconscious desires which are powerful but which are repressed by equally powerful social conventions, mores and taboos, for example, the unconscious desire to overthrow authority symbolized by a powerful father. Others think that basic wishes for power and status, legitimate ambitions and ideals, and reasonable desires and aspirations when frustrated, hindered or repressed pave the way for a revolution. *Sometimes it may be that the learning processes provided by* culture fail to sublimate primitive desires into channels which are socially adequate and acceptable, and it is the failure of learning in a dominant group which leads at first to disorganization and later to a revolution.

Another view is that social institutions and forms may have become rusted through long usage during which they have not changed with the changing times and fail to meet the new needs and demands. New inventions have upset some of the long established ways of thinking and behaving resulting in maladjustments. Old institutions develop abuses because they have outlived their usefulness and purpose. The economic order may be outmoded and the privileged classes of yesterday have to face a challenge from the new classes gathering strength and power. This clash between the old and the new may affect the political and religious spheres. The political party in power may fail to take into account the importance of new

But economic causes alone do not lead to revolutions. Downtrodden, poor and starving classes do not have the heart or the strength to protest and raise their voice much less to stand up in open revolt. There are often other areas of popular discontent as well. Socially, wealth and prosperity bring status and prestige, and poverty and want bring in humiliation and disgrace. The latter are always envying the former and trying to emulate them whenever they get an opportunity. In fact, wealth is mostly desired for the higher status it brings and also for the envy and jealousy it arouses in others. Social discontent, too, is a powerful cause in paving the way for a revolution.

Popular discontent may also be political. In our own times there is a growing desire among classes and masses for a greater participation in political authority and when such participation is denied there is popular unrest. The Indian struggle for Independence was mainly directed at wresting political power from the British because it was presumed that political power will remove our social and economic ills.

Lastly, popular discontent may be religious. People may resent critical attacks made on established religious practices by an enthusiastic reformer or they may condemn and rise against the custodians of religious institutions for the rank abuses which have crept in the church. Such revolutions were common in the West in the Middle Ages.

Revolutions in the making

But mere discontent is not enough to make a revolution. A revolution becomes possible only when a new class capable of taking the lead in solving social problems voices the prevailing discontent and the contraditions involved in the social, industrial, and political pattern of the state. Usually in every country there are two kinds of groups which foment and incite revolutions. One has a programme of encouraging discussion and criticism of the problems and difficulties inherent in our society, condemning the authorities for not making changes and solving problems and making suggestions and proposals from time to time to effect reforms in our social structure. The other is more radical in its approach. It seeks to demonstrate that the ruling classes have failed and lost the confidence of the masses, that they are incapable of solving the country's problems and

that there is only one thing to do, that is, to remove and destroy the ruling class. They promote new modes of thinking and draw up new programmes of action. In the beginning they are often a minority, meet secretly and carry on their propaganda in a concealed manner. Such secret revolutionary clubs and groups are known all over the world and preceded both the French and the Russian Revolutions. When they gather sufficient strength, they become more active and come out in the open. They engage in a bitter hostility to the existing order, awaken a new political consciousness among the masses, enlist more and more members in their party and draw up a more vigorous programme of heroic efforts and sacrifices in order to bring the country out on an upward road to their objective. The more decisively and confidently they embark upon their programme, the better they will succeed in winning more support from the public and the more isolated and demoralized will be the ruling class. The Indian National Congress played both these roles in its history of struggle against a foreign power. At first it was a moderate reformist party interested in social reform and mild criticism of the government, passing resolutions, making suggestions, organizing and mobilizing public opinion through conferences, processions, lectures, pamphlets and the like. Later it took a more radical and militant attitude though adhering to non-violence. The programme of passive resistance and non-co-operation on a mass scale was none the less revolutionary for its peaceful and non-violent character. In fact it was the largest political experiment in the world history and the Congress will always figure as the largest revolutionary group in the world for its numbers and for its massive programmes.

The success of a revolution also needs a well-knit organization in the revolutionary party so that if and when power comes the party should have an hierarchy of leaders and workers to man the new government with discipline, integrity, loyalty and public spirit. This last condition is very important.

In a wider sense the revolution is a sociological rather than a socio-psychological phenomenon. It consists of a series of events through which radical changes in a social system are made but the psychological aspect has to be analysed to throw light on other factors brought into play.

But economic causes alone do not lead to revolutions. Downtrodden, poor and starving classes do not have the heart or the strength to protest and raise their voice much less to stand up in open revolt. There are often other areas of popular discontent as well. Socially, wealth and prosperity bring status and prestige, and poverty and want bring in humiliation and disgrace. The latter are always envying the former and trying to emulate them whenever they get an opportunity. In fact, wealth is mostly desired for the higher status it brings and also for the envy and jealousy it arouses in others. Social discontent, too, is a powerful cause in paving the way for a revolution.

Popular discontent may also be political. In our own times there is a growing desire among classes and masses for a greater participation in political authority and when such participation is denied there is popular unrest. The Indian struggle for Independence was mainly directed at wresting political power from the British because it was presumed that political power will remove our social and economic ills.

Lastly, popular discontent may be religious. People may resent critical attacks made on established religious practices by an enthusiastic reformer or they may condemn and rise against the custodians of religious institutions for the rank abuses which have crept in the church. Such revolutions were common in the West in the Middle Ages.

Revolutions in the making

But mere discontent is not enough to make a revolution. A revolution becomes possible only when a new class capable of taking the lead in solving social problems voices the prevailing discontent and the contraditions involved in the social, industrial, and political pattern of the state. Usually in every country there are two kinds of groups which foment and incite revolutions. One has a programme of encouraging discussion and criticism of the problems and difficulties inherent in our society, condemning the authorities for not making changes and solving problems and making suggestions and proposals from time to time to effect reforms in our social structure. The other is more radical in its approach. It seeks to demonstrate that the ruling classes have failed and lost the confidence of the masses, that they are incapable of solving the country's problems and

that there is only one thing to do, that is, to remove and destroy the ruling class. They promote new modes of thinking and draw up new programmes of action. In the beginning they are often a minority, meet secretly and carry on their propaganda in a concealed manner. Such secret revolutionary clubs and groups are known all over the world and preceded both the French and the Russian Revolutions. When they gather sufficient strength, they become more active and come out in the open. They engage in a bitter hostility to the existing order, awaken a new political consciousness among the masses, enlist more and more members in their party and draw up a more vigorous programme of heroic efforts and sacrifices in order to bring the country out on an upward road to their objective. The more decisively and confidently they embark upon their programme, the better they will succeed in winning more support from the public and the more isolated and demoralized will be the ruling class. The Indian National Congress played both these roles in its history of struggle against a foreign power. At first it was a moderate reformist party interested in social reform and mild criticism of the government, passing resolutions, making suggestions, organizing and mobilizing public opinion through conferences, processions, lectures, pamphlets and the like. Later it took a more radical and militant attitude though adhering to non-violence. The programme of passive resistance and non-co-operation on a mass scale was none the less revolutionary for its peaceful and non-violent character. In fact it was the largest political experiment in the world history and the Congress will always figure as the largest revolutionary group in the world for its numbers and for its massive programmes.

The success of a revolution also needs a well-knit organization in the revolutionary party so that if and when power comes the party should have an hierarchy of leaders and workers to man the new government with discipline, integrity, loyalty and public spirit. This last condition is very important.

In a wider sense the revolution is a sociological rather than a socio-psychological phenomenon. It consists of a series of events through which radical changes in a social system are made but the psychological aspect has to be analysed to throw light on other factors brought into play.

But economic causes alone do not lead to revolutions. Downtrodden, poor and starving classes do not have the heart or the strength to protest and raise their voice much less to stand up in open revolt. There are often other areas of popular discontent as well. Socially, wealth and prosperity bring status and prestige, and poverty and want bring in humiliation and disgrace. The latter are always envying the former and trying to emulate them whenever they get an opportunity. In fact, wealth is mostly desired for the higher status it brings and also for the envy and jealousy it arouses in others. Social discontent, too, is a powerful cause in paving the way for a revolution.

Popular discontent may also be political. In our own times there is a growing desire among classes and masses for a greater participation in political authority and when such participation is denied there is popular unrest. The Indian struggle for Independence was mainly directed at wresting political power from the British because it was presumed that political power will remove our social and economic ills.

Lastly, popular discontent may be religious. People may resent critical attacks made on established religious practices by an enthusiastic reformer or they may condemn and rise against the custodians of religious institutions for the rank abuses which have crept in the church. Such revolutions were common in the West in the Middle Ages.

Revolutions in the making

But mere discontent is not enough to make a revolution. A revolution becomes possible only when a new class capable of taking the lead in solving social problems voices the prevailing discontent and the contraditions involved in the social, industrial, and political pattern of the state. Usually in every country there are two kinds of groups which foment and incite revolutions. One has a programme of encouraging discussion and criticism of the problems and difficulties inherent in our society, condemning the authorities for not making changes and solving problems and making suggestions and proposals from time to time to effect reforms in our social structure. The other is more radical in its approach. It seeks to demonstrate that the ruling classes have failed and lost the confidence of the masses, that they are incapable of solving the country's problems and

that there is only one thing to do, that is, to remove and destroy the ruling class. They promote new modes of thinking and draw up new programmes of action. In the beginning they are often a minority, meet secretly and carry on their propaganda in a concealed manner. Such secret revolutionary clubs and groups are known all over the world and preceded both the French and the Russian Revolutions. When they gather sufficient strength, they become more active and come out in the open. They engage in a bitter hostility to the existing order, awaken a new political consciousness among the masses, enlist more and more members in their party and draw up a more vigorous programme of heroic efforts and sacrifices in order to bring the country out on an upward road to their objective. The more decisively and confidently they embark upon their programme, the better they will succeed in winning more support from the public and the more isolated and demoralized will be the ruling class. The Indian National Congress played both these roles in its history of struggle against a foreign power. At first it was a moderate reformist party interested in social reform and mild criticism of the government, passing resolutions, making suggestions, organizing and mobilizing public opinion through conferences, processions, lectures, pamphlets and the like. Later it took a more radical and militant attitude though adhering to non-violence. The programme of passive resistance and non-co-operation on a mass scale was none the less revolutionary for its peaceful and non-violent character. In fact it was the largest political experiment in the world history and the Congress will always figure as the largest revolutionary group in the world for its numbers and for its massive programmes.

The success of a revolution also needs a well-knit organization in the revolutionary party so that if and when power comes the party should have an hierarchy of leaders and workers to man the new government with discipline, integrity, loyalty and public spirit. This last condition is very important.

In a wider sense the revolution is a sociological rather than a socio-psychological phenomenon. It consists of a series of events through which radical changes in a social system are made but the psychological aspect has to be analysed to throw light on other factors brought into play.

But economic causes alone do not lead to revolutions. Downtrodden, poor and starving classes do not have the heart or the strength to protest and raise their voice much less to stand up in open revolt. There are often other areas of popular discontent as well. Socially, wealth and prosperity bring status and prestige, and poverty and want bring in humiliation and disgrace. The latter are always envying the former and trying to emulate them whenever they get an opportunity. In fact, wealth is mostly desired for the higher status it brings and also for the envy and jealousy it arouses in others. Social discontent, too, is a powerful cause in paving the way for a revolution.

Popular discontent may also be political. In our own times there is a growing desire among classes and masses for a greater participation in political authority and when such participation is denied there is popular unrest. The Indian struggle for Independence was mainly directed at wresting political power from the British because it was presumed that political power will remove our social and economic ills.

Lastly, popular discontent may be religious. People may resent critical attacks made on established religious practices by an enthusiastic reformer or they may condemn and rise against the custodians of religious institutions for the rank abuses which have crept in the church. Such revolutions were common in the West in the Middle Ages.

Revolutions in the making

But mere discontent is not enough to make a revolution. A revolution becomes possible only when a new class capable of taking the lead in solving social problems voices the prevailing discontent and the contraditions involved in the social, industrial, and political pattern of the state. Usually in every country there are two kinds of groups which foment and incite revolutions. One has a programme of encouraging discussion and criticism of the problems and difficulties inherent in our society, condemning the authorities for not making changes and solving problems and making suggestions and proposals from time to time to effect reforms in our social structure. The other is more radical in its approach. It seeks to demonstrate that the ruling classes have failed and lost the confidence of the masses, that they are incapable of solving the country's problems and

that there is only one thing to do, that is, to remove and destroy the ruling class. They promote new modes of thinking and draw up new programmes of action. In the beginning they are often a minority, meet secretly and carry on their propaganda in a concealed manner. Such secret revolutionary clubs and groups are known all over the world and preceded both the French and the Russian Revolutions. When they gather sufficient strength, they become more active and come out in the open. They engage in a bitter hostility to the existing order, awaken a new political consciousness among the masses, enlist more and more members in their party and draw up a more vigorous programme of heroic efforts and sacrifices in order to bring the country out on an upward road to their objective. The more decisively and confidently they embark upon their programme, the better they will succeed in winning more support from the public and the more isolated and demoralized will be the ruling class. The Indian National Congress played both these roles in its history of struggle against a foreign power. At first it was a moderate reformist party interested in social reform and mild criticism of the government, passing resolutions, making suggestions, organizing and mobilizing public opinion through conferences, processions, lectures, pamphlets and the like. Later it took a more radical and militant attitude though adhering to non-violence. The programme of passive resistance and non-co-operation on a mass scale was none the less revolutionary for its peaceful and non-violent character. In fact it was the largest political experiment in the world history and the Congress will always figure as the largest revolutionary group in the world for its numbers and for its massive programmes.

The success of a revolution also needs a well-knit organization in the revolutionary party so that if and when power comes the party should have an hierarchy of leaders and workers to man the new government with discipline, integrity, loyalty and public spirit. This last condition is very important.

In a wider sense the revolution is a sociological rather than a socio-psychological phenomenon. It consists of a series of events through which radical changes in a social system are made but the psychological aspect has to be analysed to throw light on other factors brought into play.

The role of leaders

The role of leaders in a revolution is indisputable and very significant though leaders alone cannot effect a revolution. And any revolution by itself is not a change in the social system, rather it is a change in the leadership and then new leaders bring about social changes. The common man is inclined to believe that radical and extremist leaders make a revolution, while the truth is that leaders only mobilize the already prevailing discontent and co-ordinate and direct mass movements. They cannot create conditions of discontent.

We have mentioned above that at first popular unrest is moderate and people wish to reform things, and later the movement becomes radical and violent and people wish to destroy and re-build. This shift is reflected in leadership also. At first the leaders are moderate, intellectual and critical, and later they are replaced by those who want action, violence and results. The former are very necessary in so far as they stimulate thinking and awaken masses to an acute awareness of their disabilities, social, economic and political ills. Writers begin to find fault with their own social order, to question the validity of laws and customs and the value and effectiveness of institutions. Writers like Diderot, Voltaire and Rousseau raised basic questions about the foundations of the state and society and paved the way for the French Revolution. In Russia, Pushkin, Tolstoy, Kropotkin, Gorky, Lenin, and Trotsky were intellectuals who revolutionized ways of thought in philosophy, literature, politics and economics and prepared the masses for a change. But these intellectuals were not capable of overthrowing established authority by themselves. They did not start, foment or shape the revolution. That was the work of organizations and leaders who later took over. In India too early leaders were more or less academicians who delivered eloquent speeches and wrote strong articles but it was later leaders who imparted a religious zeal to political campaigning, organized constructive programmes and Satyagraha and led mass movements like the Salt Satyagraha or Quit India movement. Fortunately in India the two roles of leaders were combined, agitation and organization went together and leaders of pre-Independence days were intellectuals of high calibre, had remarkable insight into public affairs and gave evidence of very superior efficiency in all areas

of life and work. What is more they were held in high esteem by the people for the nobility of their character, their spirit of sacrifice, their patriotism and devotion to the national cause. People loved and worshipped Gandhi and Nehru and the strength and prestige of these leaders rested on this popular support.

We may put it the other way that revolutions are the result of the failure of reactionary leaders to adjust to changing conditions and they in the end overthrow such leadership. It was the old traditional conservative attitude of the French aristocrats that led to the revolution and their downfall. They refused to give political recognition to the new classes which were coming as a result of the economic changes. The British rulers in India failed to see that Western education had given Indians an understanding of the ways they were being exploited and had fired them with national aspirations and ideals which they must have the freedom to cherish and realize.

In almost every type of revolution the discontented masses kill and destroy whomsoever they consider to be the cause of their miseries. Rioting, vindictiveness, arson, and violence are a common feature of the revolution. The French and the Russian Revolutions had their massacres and murders Often the State authorities make a scapegoat of someone in the government to pacify the wrath of the people It makes no difference to the masses who the victim is or was, but the climax is resolved in favour of those whose leadership is threatened. Americans have their 'lynching' and Russians their 'purges'. In the revolutionary programme of Mahatma Gandhi there was no place for hatred and revenge He repeatedly preached that he hated the British rule but loved the British people, and called off the movement whenever there was the least risk of rioting and killing. In this respect the Indian revolutionary movement was unique, that it was directed against a régime but not against the leaders of that régime, but then its leader Mahatma Gandhi was unique in his advocacy and practice of truth and non-violence, of freedom from hatred and revenge, and of carrying on struggle by peaceful means.

War

Wars are as old as humanity. Too many people believe them to be inevitable for human groups will always be struggling for resources and power. In olden times people believed that war was a divine institution meant to bring out all that is noble and sublime in human beings and invoked God's blessings for victory. Wars are for the glorification of man and his bravery, strength, skill, strategy, and even generosity and nobility. To-day two world wars have convinced most people that war is a curse, an unmitigated evil which must be avoided and banished if humanity and its glorious achievements in the arts and sciences of civilization are to survive. The use of atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan during World War II wiped out tens of thousands of people and devastated and rendered barren miles of land. Today with the development of much more powerful nuclear weapons the horrors of war are being realized all over the civilized world and world leaders while making preparations for war are equally anxious to avoid it. War is today the world problem number one and whenever war is discussed people have a vague hope that a solution of this problem will be forthcoming.

It should be borne in mind that modern wars are not declared by the mass of people but by selected leaders, and therefore the biological argument in favour of war should be weighed in the light of this consideration. In fact some individuals and minority groups are actively opposed to national wars.

Another fact of considerable importance is that some wars are declared by groups in power just to distract the attention of the people from internal troubles, faults of administration or conflict among political interests, to stage some dramatic incident to retain themselves in positions of authority or to safeguard economic and business interests. Some wars are fought to right a past wrong or to satisfy military ambition, and some wars are sparked off by some chance incident.

Social psychology is primarily concerned with social conditions under which individuals respond to the call for war, with many phases of propaganda directed towards securing co-operation in the war effort or toward breaking the morale of the enemy camp, with people's attitude to war and with changes in social behaviour during the war.

Is war inevitable?

Because human history all over the world is punctuated by wars fairly regularly many people believe that there are some basic aspects of human nature which make war inevitable and look cynically at every effort to banish war and build abiding peace. On analysis the argument in support of the inevitability of war resolves itself into three reasons. In the first place it is argued that war is a divine institution, but there is no evidence to support this statement and no religion describes God as a war-monger. Secondly, it is argued that there will always be war because there has always been war. Anthropologists have discovered communities to whom war is unknown and pacifism is not without a history. Thirdly, it is argued that human nature cannot be changed and war is grounded in the instinctive nature of man. We have already seen that our concept of human nature changes with change in culture. Even if it is conceded that fighting and competition are instinctive it cannot be advocated on their basis that the instinct for war is universal.

In 1945 was published *Human Nature and Enduring Peace* under the editorship of Gardiner Murphy and it included a section 'The Psychologists' Manifesto' which was a series of statements about war and peace signed by more than 2,000 psychologists of America. The first part of the statement answered the question: Is war inevitable or is man naturally and instinctively war-like? It ran, 'War can be avoided; war is not born in men; it is built into men. No race, nation or social group is inevitably warlike.' It goes on to point out that it is possible to reduce conflicts and tensions which lead to war and people can realize their ambitions and interests by and through co-operation. What aggressive and fighting tendencies they have can be expressed and exercised in fighting such natural obstacles as disease, ignorance, famine or poverty. WHO (World Health Organization), UNESCO and similar international organizations have done very useful work in this direction, and much more can be achieved through international co-operation and understanding. The preamble to the constitution of the UNESCO (United Nations' Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization) points out, 'Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed', thus asserting its faith in the fact that wars can be

avoided.

Biological interpretation of war

It has already been stressed that in history war and peace alternate and wars have been fought for a large variety of reasons like survival, revenge, greed, religion, freedom, food, land, glory or business interests. There have been local strifes in which one tribe or clan was pitted against another tribe or clan. There have been national wars in which one country or nation fought against another. And there have been global wars in which one group of powerful nations has fought an all-out devastating war against another group of equally powerful nations. The invention and development of atom bombs and nuclear weapons has made wars still more terrifying. The two world wars meant a colossal destruction of life and property and it would be magnified several times by the next war if it takes place. Many people think that the very survival of man is at stake. That is why attempts to eliminate a global war through disarmament and international co-operation and understanding are welcomed by a majority of nations intent on development plans and raising the standard of living of common people.

But many social thinkers continue to hold that wars are based on biological struggle and cannot be eliminated. All over the animal kingdom the biological struggle for survival of the fittest is constantly going on. Similarly, it is argued that in international struggle the fittest nation will survive. But in the last decade numerous large-scale programmes have been implemented to help the growth and development of underdeveloped and backward countries and nations. The more prosperous and advanced countries are voluntarily offering help in money, material and technological know-how to less advanced countries. The Colombo Plan, the World Bank, the Marshall Plan, the International Monetary Fund, UNESCO, WHO and the like are glorious examples of international co-operation and conclusively rebut the argument of biological struggle for survival of the fittest.

Another explanation of war is offered in terms of the fighting instinct or the instinct of pugnacity. Though many laymen still think in these terms the doctrine of instinct has been laid on

the shelf by psychologists. William James argues that we inherit the warlike type. Ancient tribes were constantly fighting among themselves, and since tribes not warlike did not survive against the warlike we have inherited from the latter a strong tendency to fight and a nervous system which readily responds to warlike conditions. According to this view people do not take to wars because of economic or political reasons. Wars are highly irrational and man plunges into primeval activity of warfare because of the instinct of pugnacity. Examples of fighting and quarrelling among children are cited to prove man's fighting instinct; how children fight at street corners and in gangs; how aggressively games of football and baseball are played even to the extent of injuring each other and how adults enjoy when boxers draw blood and batter each other, show that fighting is a fundamental human trait, and there is no escape from wars. Humanity has never been able to get rid of wars and therefore wars must be satisfying some fundamental human tendency.

Freud too stresses that people respond readily to the call of war because they are instinctively and naturally destructive. This destructive and aggressive behaviour results from acute frustrations of many human drives Freud puts forward a 'death instinct' which is opposed by a unifying sex instinct, and their duality causes conflict and frustration. That frustration leads to aggression is a fact of common experience. Even in a prosperous country like America large masses of people are subject to frustration of intense needs. The needs may be connected with food, clothing and shelter or they may be needs of economic security of personal power, prestige, opportunity or self-expression. Monopolies, discrimination, competition and the like breed frustration. At the national level strong needs for direct advantage, national power and prestige, national and patriotic needs or the needs of escaping from the drabness of peace may be frustrated leading to aggression Frustration produces tension and one of the simplest ways of resolving tension is aggression War is commonly resorted to as a means of relieving international tension Regarding frustration-aggression link we have already observed in a previous chapter that it is not universal and in many situations frustration leads to renewed and doubled effort to overcome the frustration. Frustration does not always lead to aggression and in

avoided.

Biological interpretation of war

It has already been stressed that in history war and peace alternate and wars have been fought for a large variety of reasons like survival, revenge, greed, religion, freedom, food, land, glory or business interests. There have been local strifes in which one tribe or clan was pitted against another tribe or clan. There have been national wars in which one country or nation fought against another. And there have been global wars in which one group of powerful nations has fought an all-out devastating war against another group of equally powerful nations. The invention and development of atom bombs and nuclear weapons has made wars still more terrifying. The two world wars meant a colossal destruction of life and property and it would be magnified several times by the next war if it takes place. Many people think that the very survival of man is at stake. That is why attempts to eliminate a global war through disarmament and international co-operation and understanding are welcomed by a majority of nations intent on development plans and raising the standard of living of common people.

But many social thinkers continue to hold that wars are based on biological struggle and cannot be eliminated. All over the animal kingdom the biological struggle for survival of the fittest is constantly going on. Similarly, it is argued that in international struggle the fittest nation will survive. But in the last decade numerous large-scale programmes have been implemented to help the growth and development of under-developed and backward countries and nations. The more prosperous and advanced countries are voluntarily offering help in money, material and technological know-how to less advanced countries. The Colombo Plan, the World Bank, the Marshall Plan, the International Monetary Fund, UNESCO, WHO and the like are glorious examples of international co-operation and conclusively rebut the argument of biological struggle for survival of the fittest.

Another explanation of war is offered in terms of the fighting instinct or the instinct of pugnacity. Though many laymen still think in these terms the doctrine of instinct has been laid on

United Nations' Organization. International tensions are discussed and the aggressor is condemned. During fighting certain social norms are accepted by both the belligerents such as not striking a fallen soldier or a soldier throwing up his arms in surrender, treating prisoners of wars more humanely or sparing women and children. In *Mahabharata* there were definite conventions that an unarmed enemy should not be struck or should not be hit below the belt. Thus it appears that social conditions of war are very important, the fighting has been learned and that man can also be taught not to fight.

Social interpretation of war

A study and analysis of human behaviour before and after the declaration of war reveals anything but a fighting instinct. When war clouds gather on the political horizon people pray and hope that war would be averted When war is ultimately declared people cheer the leaders, shout and sing in joy and enthusiasm, and clamour for victory. When armistice is announced people again shout with joy that there will be no more killing and destruction. For some people war is an opportunity for self-advancement in career and business and they are sorry that it has ended too soon. It is difficult to explain this behaviour in terms of instincts for fighting or peace, and its origins must be sought in early training and social conditions.

In many countries young people are inducted into ways of war and military training early in life. Children have a fascination for stories of war and military heroism. Biographies of war heroes and warriors receive greater emphasis and importance in textbooks than stories of saints and poets We know that in India Babar, Rana Sanga, Rana Pratap, Guru Gobind Singh and Shivaji are very popular names in children's books and the emphasis is not on their contribution to peace but on their bravery in the battlefield.

During the formative periods of adolescence and youth National Cadet Corps, Republic Day parades, mass drills and marching influence the character traits and ideals of young people in favour of military ways. Compulsory military training in schools and colleges is justified for teaching discipline and promoting physical health. In many countries leaders try to teach patriotism by regimenting the thoughts and feelings of

many frustration situations individuals are stimulated to renewed and increased effort to overcome causes of frustration. But group frustrations leading to international tension are most often exploited by national leaders so that the higher the level of frustration the stronger the feeling of aggressiveness toward other countries. Leaders organize and direct these feelings against other nations and mobilize national resources for armed aggression or such hostile acts as economic blockade.

Cannon's researches show that there is a close parallel between the behaviour of men in war and the behaviour of animals under conditions exciting rage, pain and fear. Under the stress of these emotions the organism makes stronger and repeated efforts to make effective adjustments to a critical situation. All the physiological resources are mobilized to meet the emergency and these emotions are aroused when there is opposition to the goal-seeking activity of the organism. Now emotions like rage and fear are very useful to animals in making adjustive movements in a stress situation but it is doubtful if they are equally useful to the modern man whose attempts at survival are greatly influenced by socio-cultural factors.

We have already stressed that wars may be fought from many motives just as conflict among individuals may be motivated by hunger, fear or sex. Some wars have been fought for sex. Sita, Helen and Padmini were the causes of war between Ram and Ravan, of the Trojan war and the Mughal war respectively. Wars has been fought to extend empires, to plunder gold and silver, to secure raw material for trade and the like. To interpret wars just by one instinct of pugnacity or aggressiveness seems to simplify the issue a little too much. The avowed war aims of the belligerent nations during the two world wars could not be explained in terms of aggressiveness alone. There was idealism, patriotism, freedom, love for democracy, hunger for glory and joy in the annihilation of the enemy. An explanation based on instinct would be extremely inadequate if not silly.

In wars many social, economic, political, racial and even religious factors come into play. Imperialism, ideologies like communism and socialism, religious intolerance, national insults and other social conditions have led to wars in the past. Some of these conditions are openly denounced by big powers and the

Chinese committed naked aggression against us there was no other alternative but to defend national security at all costs. During this emergency and during any war for that matter, the following psychological processes are involved.

The first is *appeal to tradition.* Our leaders not only appealed to our tradition of heroism and bravery but also to our tradition of not conquering other countries, and condemned China also for her tradition of grabbing other peoples' land. Hitler too appealed to the German tradition of strong patriotism and nationalism.

Because most people cannot understand complex explanation of events simple slogans and formulas are made current such as 'the Chinese Dragon', 'the Yankee imperialist'. This is *simplification.*

People's *frustration* and aggressive feelings are directed toward the enemy. National leaders of the opposite camp become symbols of common hatred and the cause of national frustration. Each party blames the other for starting the war.

Each camp tries to *demoralize the enemy country.* The Chinese did it and so did Hitler. In the brief period of conflict with the Chinese, India made no such attempts though she had done her utmost to apprise all countries of the world how wild and unjust are the claims of the Chinese.

Every means is used to *reinforce* the war attitudes of people. Nazi propaganda machine of repeating lies till they are ac-
as truth is a case in point. Attempts are made by either
to associate the enemy with something hateful. India was
with capitalism and imperialism by the Chinese just as
were abused as Jews and capitalists by the Germans.
is frequently used. The Germans called them-
-yans' and their enemies as either 'commies' or 'Jews'.
is also common. Hitler became the symbol of
people as Churchill became the symbol of Allies.
adopted the Swastika the latter used the V-sign
effect.
tries to *rationalize* its defeats and explain events in

things are different. There is freedom of the
to win the help and co-operation of all sections
take all large measures after full discussion at

least with top leaders of major parties and the like, and they place limitations on the programme of propaganda. The psychology of propaganda has already been dealt with in a previous chapter.

Measurement of attitudes toward war

What people think about armament, peace or actual war does not necessarily indicate whether they will oppose or approve of war. Many people will support legislation for military measures or even join the army, navy or air force without in the least favouring war, and many people favouring peace may yet respond to the symbols of war when it is declared. Many people actually engaged in fighting a war may hate it and many people devoted and committed to peaceful methods in resolving international tension may be roused to support a war to fight great injustice done by the aggressor. Nationalism and propaganda do influence attitudes to war. Again prejudices may modify our attitude to war against nations we hate.

War attiudes are not simple and have numerous facets. It is therefore very difficult to devise any definite measuring scale. That is why some of the methods for measuring attitudes are not applicable to the measurement of attitudes toward war. In fact attitudes toward war are widely distributed. Militarism does not necessarily mean a desire for war but just support for legislation ensuring war preparedness. India practises militarism in the sense that it maintains a large and efficient army for its defence but her militarism is very much different from that of China for example. China holds that war is the only means of human salvation and bringing about communism. Similarly, pacifism which is considered the opposite of militarism may mean total abandonment of war under all circumstances or just a strong desire to resolve all international conflicts through peaceful means of discussion and negotiation. And between them there are a number of shades. But it is not always easy to have a continuum denoting definite degrees of approval or disapproval and the practicability of having a scale for the measurement of attitudes toward war is very much reduced. Some attempts have been made in America to study distribution of attitudes toward militarism and pacifism of college students and their parents, and they have ranged categories into extreme militarism, moderate militarism,

moderate pacifism and extreme pacifism. They show that male-students and their fathers are more inclined to extreme militarism than to extreme pacifism and female students and their mothers are inclined more to extreme pacifism than to extreme militarism, and that the fathers are more militaristic than sons, and mothers are more pacifistic than daughters.

Non-violence and war

War is a violent method of resolving international tensions and group conflicts. It breeds vengeance and hatred and recurs in cycles because hatred produces greater hatred and vengeance leads to greater vengeance at the other end. Mahatma Gandhi saw that war degrades man to the level of a beast, and proposed non-violence as a peaceful method of solving problems and resolving international tensions. The two world wars did not solve any problem. Rather they aggravated problems and laid the foundation of the next war. With the development of nuclear weapons it has been all the more clearly brought home to all thinking people that war cannot promise to solve any problems at all. Non-violence is peaceful problem-solving and provides moral equivalent to the motivations stirred by war. Under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi India demonstrated to the world that large masses of common people could be very effectively organized to act non-violently even in circumstances of extreme difficulty to achieve a social purpose and experience the thrill of a just and rightful fight. The development of nuclear weapons has made violent problem-solving unthinkable for it will mean international suicide. So if human life is to continue and if human problems have to be solved they must in future be solved in a non-violent way.

Already membership of the nuclear club is increasing. More and more countries are able to make atom bombs. China is the latest big nation to blast a nuclear device, and more states may be tempted to acquire fission and fusion bombs in very near future. The arms race is continuing at an accelerated rate but all right-minded people are convinced that this race for more and more deadly weapons will not provide any security to a country nor a prospect of survival for humanity. The only certainty the race for nuclear weapons provides is that of wholesale annihilation and disaster. There is distrust, hatred, and fear in

international relations, and they are not helpful to sane and rational thinking. The atmosphere is charged with mutual suspicion and at any time any minor incident may spark off a major conflict. Mankind's only hope is that there are individuals of integrity and sanity in every country whose conscience has been awakened to the requirements of the impending future catastrophe made almost inescapable by the rapid recent advances in science and technology. They are pleading for greater and closer international understanding and co-operation, for disarmament and moratorium on nuclear tests, for reducing mutual hatred and fear and for banning war and resolving all international issues in a peaceful manner. In India Mahatma Gandhi used passive resistance and non-violent non-co-operation with telling effect against the most powerful régime in history. The methods used by Gandhi have spread, and many helpless suppressed and depressed communities all over the world are employing the methods indicated and employed by Gandhi in India and South Africa. In a number of African states the Negroes have adopted the ideas and techniques of Gandhi. The American Negroes too have used non-violence and passive resistance. Some leaders of independence movements in Africa have encouraged its use. France too had a non-violent, civil disobedience movement against the Algerian war. In the United States and the United Kingdom there are impressive non-violent civil disobedience movements against atomic armaments. Thus the acceptance of non-violence is spreading and what was just an idea conceived by a man of integrity and conscience is spreading fast into a world movement and is a great step forward on the road to a peaceful social order. Dr Zakir Hussain concluded his address to the Anti-Nuclear Arms Convention held in New Delhi in June 1962, with these words: 'We are poised for a moral break-through. A moral break-through is never the function of power. It is the privilege of the individual conscience.'

But a non-violent struggle is not without its limitations. If the power against whom the non-violent struggle is waged has no moral scruples and decides to destroy the non-violent people or party ruthlessly, there is little hope for the latter and they may face total annihilation or be compelled to take up arms and fight violence with violence. The truth of this observation was recently borne out in Bangladesh where Shaikh Mujibur Rehman and

his National Awami Party hoped to achieve freedom through non-violent non-cooperation but meeting ruthless inhuman suppression through murder, arson and rape resorted to armed resistance.

Promoting peace

The first step in any programme of promoting peace is to understand the causes of aggressive nationalism and war. Much of the nationalism and international tension can be traced to the attitudes and stereotypes deliberately taught and cultivated in the home and school, and through propaganda in newspapers, radio, motion pictures and other media of mass communication Some cultural factors also promote negative attitudes towards out-groups. All of us have certain attitudes toward Americans, Russians and Chinese. Some people deliberately stimulate aggressive nationalism because they have a vested interest in war. History books teach that nationalism is the only effective defence against aggression Cultural differences and lack of knowledge and understanding of other peoples and their ways breed prejudice, suspicion, fear and hatred among nations.

We may detail here some of the steps which nations have taken to promote peace and safeguard the outbreak of another war.

There is, in the first place, the United Nations' Organization whose membership extends to all nations big and small and whose charter expresses a determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. It is based on the sovereign equality of all its members and its avowed purposes are as below:

'1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes of situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

2 To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace,

3. To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in

promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and form fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion; and

4. To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends'.

The UNO has provided a forum for discussion, for exchange of views of different nations and for creating strong public opinion in favour of peace. It symbolizes man's great desire and hunger for peace. Various other international organizations like the World Health Organization, the World Food Organization, the United Nations' Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organizations (UNESCO) provide international co-operation in various fields of social living like food, health, education, culture, science and technology besides promoting a strong international outlook. Exchanges of cultural delegations, scholars, scientists and professors; facilities for foreign travels, foreign scholarships for higher studies; study of special problems of a country by international teams of experts; international conferences and conventions, and visits of foreign diplomats and dignitaries have recently been greatly increased, and they all help to promote international understanding and co-operation, bring different peoples together and pave the way for a peaceful discussion and solution of international problems and disputes. UNESCO has gone so far as to bring out textbooks for school children designed to influence attitudes of young people to war.

Again there is a worldwide movement among all modern nations to help with resources and know-how the development and progress of the underdeveloped countries, to raise their standard of living and to enable them to stand on their own legs for their common needs. Not only the big countries like U.S.A., U K. and Russia but also Japan, Germany, France, India and the like have programmes of giving loans and aid to countries struggling in their march towards progress. Better roads, more food, medicines, books, tools, machines; bigger laboratories, workshops, factories; and above all experts and technical knowledge and skill are being freely offered.

But more than anything else the knowledge and realization that large-scale production of nuclear weapons and their use in another global war will spell wholesale annihilation and utter destruction of mankind and civilization has compelled powerful

nations to change their attitudes toward war and one another and to take a more sober, sane and rational view of war. The two giants, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. while competing with each other in perfecting and improving nuclear weapons are also trying to excel each other in professing and declaring their strong desire and love for peace. While there is no diminution in their efforts at preparedness, both powers are sincere and earnest in their condemnation of war. It is not religion, morality or idealism which has improved the prospects for peace but the hard realities of the situation that war will kill and destroy all. 'Sufficient unto the day the evil thereof'.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

YOUNG K. *Handbook of Social Psychology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd).

SARGENT, S. S. and WILLIAMSON, R C *Social Psychology* (New York: The Ronald Press Company)

BIRO, CHARLES. *Social Psychology (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co)*.

Gandhi Marg, A Quarterly Journal of Gandhian Thought (New Delhi: Gandhi Smarak Nidhi)

BRITT, S. H *Social Psychology of Modern Life* (New York: Rinehart & Company Inc).

KRECH and CRUTCHFIELD, *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc).

INDEX